THE PHOENICIAN HISTORY OF PHILO OF BYBLOS

Albert Irwin Baumgarten

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Political Science
Columbia University
1972

XUM

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.
Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

XUM

ABSTRACT

THE PHOENICIAN HISTORY OF PHILO OF BYBLOS

Albert Irwin Baumgarten

This dissertation is a historical commentary on the fragments of the Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos (F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, Vol. 3C^2, pp. 802-824). Philo claims that the History is a translation of the work of an ancient author, Sanchuniathon, from Phoenician to Greek. Sanchuniathon, according to Philo, antedated Hesiod. Thus, if Philo's claims are true, the History would contain information on Phoenician religion and mythology from about 1000 B.C.

Philo's claims have provoked controversy. While scholars in the past were suspicious of their validity, our century has seen a defense of Philo based on newly discovered Near Eastern sources; his claims have been widely accepted as close to the truth. This dissertation attempts to reconsider these questions and to determine the nature and date of the source(s) Philo used in composing his History.

The dissertation begins with a brief discussion of the main problems, after which Jacoby's text is reproduced. The testimonies concerning Philo's life are then analyzed. I tentatively conclude that Philo lived from ca. 70-ca. 160 A.D. This suggestion, however, is far from certain, as there is insufficient evidence.

The accounts of Sanchuniathon(by Porphyry, Philo and others) are discussed next. Sanchuniathon, I maintain, was apparently a great religious authority of Phoenician antiquity about whom many traditions circulated. The accounts by Porphyry and Philo, however, betray many Hellenistic concerns; thus Philo makes him a Euhemerist. This arouses suspicion as to the date of

the material ascribed to Sanchuniathon.

A commentary on the main group of fragments - the verse cosmogony, the "discoverers" section, the account of the life and wars of Kronos, and the sections on child sacrifice and snakes - follows. Philo has arranged his work as if these sections formed a consecutive narrative, each section commencing where the prior one ended. It seems, however, that the sections overlap. Philo, or some predecessor, has apparently compiled the traditions of several Phoenician cities. The purpose of the compilation may have been the systematization and organization of Phoenician mythology.

As to the date of the contents, recent discoveries from the Near East have suggested new understandings of some difficult passages but have not substantiated Philo's claims. Scholars who maintained that the discoveries vindicated Philo and proved the antiquity of his material were, in my opinion, overly impressed by what they suddenly understood. Philo does present Phoenician traditions: this is indisputable. But he has not somehow discovered and preserved unaltered texts from hoary antiquity. Rather, he has claimed that the myths, as told in his time and disfigured by his theses, are the true ancient versions.

In conclusion, the material preserved by Philo affords a valuable insight into the Phoenician religion as understood by one man of the early Roman empire. He has distorted the traditional mythology to fit his own theories, but behind the distortions one can see the outlines of a more traditional mythology and religion. That religion had been living, not sterile or stagnant, since the Bronze Age. It had changed in response to new conditions, particularly in response to the contact with Greek culture, but major elements of the Bronze Age cults are still recognizable.

XUM

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A reader of this dissertation should find his work facilitated by having Jacoby's excellent edition of the fragments of Philo's History included as Chapter Two. I would like to thank E.J. Brill & Co. of Leiden, Holland, the owners of the copyright on Jacoby's book, for their kind permission to reproduce Jacoby's text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
ONE	THE MAIN PROBLEMS	1
TWO	THE GREEK TEXT	6
THREE	BIOGRAPHICAL DATA	29
FOUR	PORPHYRY'S ACCOUNT OF SANCHUNIATHON	43
FIVE	PHILO'S ACCOUNT OF SANCHUNIATHON	73
SIX	THE COSMOGONY	120
SEVEN	THE DISCOVERERS	168
EIGHT	THE LIFE OF KRONOS	213
NINE		253
TEN		284
ELEVEN	CONCLUSIONS	304
INDEX OF ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY		312

XUM

CHAPTER ONE

THE MAIN PROBLEMS

i

The fragments of the Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos have been frequently studied during the past four centuries.[1] These fragments interested scholars because of their difficulty and obscurity.[2] In addition, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries they were virtually the sole extra-Biblical evidence concerning the Phoenicians. Scholars realized that the practices and beliefs of the Phoenicians, linguistically and geographically tied to Israel, might shed light on the world of the Bible. Hence they turned to Philo.

Throughout the centuries the central issues have remained unchanged. Philo makes several claims in his work: (1) that he is doing nothing more than translating the work of Sanchuniathon, an ancient author, from Phoenician to Greek; (2) that such Phoenician documents,

---

[1] The earliest study of the fragments to my knowledge was Scaliger's Emend. Temporum, in 1583.

[2] The difficulty and obscurity of the text is probably responsible for Philo's having attracted his share of eccentrics. These would include Court de Gebelin, Allégories Orientales, Wagenfeld and Charroux. Wagenfeld is, of course, responsible for the famous forgery of the "complete" text of the Phoenician History discussed in the appendix to Chapter Three. Charroux's Maîtres du Monde is perhaps the most interesting, as it was written in 1967. Charroux argues that Philo's Ouranos, Kronos, etc. were visitors on earth from other planets who arrived in rockets or flying saucers, Maîtres du Monde, pp. 57-61.

XUM

misappropriated and improperly understood, were the sources of Hesiod and much in Greek mythology; and (3) that the most ancient peoples (i.e. the Phoenicians and Egyptians) were Euhemerists and worshiped only dead human benefactors and the forces of nature. These claims are responsible for the main problems which have dominated the discussion of the Phoenician History. What sources did Philo use in composing his work and what were their dates? Did Philo have any very ancient document(s) from which he worked directly? What is the true relationship between Philo's stories and Hesiod? Finally, is Sanchuniathon a historical personality, a legendary hero or religious authority, or a fiction created by Philo or by some prior forger?

While these questions have, of course, been variously answered,[3] the tendency prior to this century was to doubt the validity of Philo's claims. Philo's sources were not believed as old as he maintains, and the similarities to Hesiod were explained by the conclusion that Philo or someone else copied Hesiod. Recent discoveries in the Near East, particularly those at Ugarit and Boghazköi, have reopened these questions. We can now read texts written in the second millenium B.C. at Ugarit and learn directly the mythology traditional there. Ugaritic texts have illuminated a number of obscure passages in Philo, while the Hittite myths have introduced a new factor into the relationship between Philo and Hesiod, as they contain a similar story.

These new sources have, on the whole, made scholars more willing to accept Philo's claims, and while no one (to my knowledge) has maintained that Philo was correct in all respects, he now receives a more sympathetic reading. At the very least, scholars have concluded that Philo has been "somewhat vindicated" by the discoveries at Ugarit.[4] More extreme is the position of Eissfeldt, who concludes that Sanchuniathon actually lived in Beirut in the second half of the second millenium B.C. His work survived to be adapted and brought somewhat "up to date" by Philo.[5] Eissfeldt probably inspired Walcot to adopt the most extreme position I have seen.[6] In discussing the Greek myths of Typhon, Walcot is puzzled by the fact that certain aspects of the story in Apollodorus "are best understood if we refer not to Greek but to Hittite mythology. [But] the period of time which separates Apollodorus from the Hittite myths . . . is immense, comprising as it does a thousand and more years."[7] Walcot proposes to explain this difficulty by assuming that "Apollodorus took advantage of the work of Hellenistic scholars who studied and translated texts current at the time when great empires controlled the Near East."[8] As proof that such ancient materials were still available and were being translated, Walcot cites Manetho and Berossus and then turns to consider possible survivals of the Gilgamesh epic in Greek and Latin literature.[9] The final, "more positive clue," is the "vital piece of information about the material available to Philo of Byblos."[10] After a brief discussion of the problems of dating the materials in Philo, Walcot writes that "It is surely reasonable to conclude that Philo did actually translate from Phoenician into Greek a text like those we know from Ugarit, and that his name should, therefore, be added to those of Berossus and his colleagues."[11] According to Walcot, at least one of Philo's claims is true.

---

[3] A summary of the historiography can be found in Clemen, pp. 1-15 and in Eissfeldt, T. und S., pp. 51-54.

---

[4] Bidez-Cumont, Mages Hellénisés, Vol. 1, p. 101, quoted with approval by Clemen, p. 77. Williams, pp. 198-199 reached a similar conclusion.

[5] Eissfeldt has changed his opinion on these questions. The position cited is that of T. und S., p. 70, but cf. Eissfeldt, RS, pp. 67-71.

[6] That Walcot was inspired by Eissfeldt is suggested by his citation of Eissfeldt, S. von B., pp. 58ff. in developing his argument in Hesiod, p. 18.

[7] Walcot, Hesiod, p. 15.

[8] Ibid., p. 16.

In a historiographical perspective there are obvious reasons for caution and skepticism. For the past hundred years each new set of discoveries has been triumphantly proclaimed the new key to Philo. Enthused, and hence uncritical, scholars have amplified occasional insights into complete explanations of the many difficulties in Philo. The best example of this process is Halevy's analysis of the cosmogony on the basis of the Enuma Elish, the new discovery of Halevy's day.[12]

These remarks should not be read as suggesting that the Ugaritic and Hittite texts have not illuminated some obscure passages in the fragments. They have. Hence the "rehabilitation" of Philo based on these sources has become virtually universally accepted during the past generation. I propose to attempt a thorough analysis of the text in the hope that it will yield sufficient clues for a critical evaluation of the main problems.

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[10] Ibid., p. 17.

[11] Ibid., p. 18.

[12] Halevy, "Pothos et Mot." See below, Chapter Six, p. 141, n. 57.

XUM

?

ii

There is no need to collect or edit afresh the fragments of the Phoenician History. Jacoby, in volume 3C^2 of his Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, has collected and edited the fragments.[13] One caution applies in using Jacoby--for those fragments which come from Eusebius' Preparation for the Gospel, Jacoby's critical apparatus should be compared with that in Mras' edition of Eusebius.[14] Jacoby utilized Mras, but only reprints a part of the critical apparatus.

With this one caution, Jacoby's text, reprinted as Chapter Two of this dissertation, will be the basis for the discussion of Philo. All reference to the fragments throughout will be by page and line numbers in Jacoby.

---

[13] Earlier editions of the fragments were those of Orelli, Bunsen, and Müller, FHG, Vol. 3, pp. 560ff. Williams, in apparent ignorance of Jacoby, edited the fragments afresh but only utilized those in Eusebius and was apparently unaware of the few scraps of information available in other authors. Williams, pp. 53-68.

[14] Mras, Praeparatio Evangelica.

CHAPTER TWO

THE GREEK TEXT

δ' ἐν τῆι δευτέραι τῶν Περσικῶν (693 F 1) μνημονεύει τούτου τοῦ βασιλέως (des Nabuchodonosor) καὶ Φιλόστρατος ἐν ταῖς ['Ινδικαῖς καὶ] Φοινικικαῖς ἱστορίαις, ὅτι οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπολιόρκησε τὴν Τύρον ἔτεσι τρισὶ καὶ δέκα, βασιλεύοντος κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν 'Ιθωβάλου τῆς Τύρου. **b)** JOSEPH. *c. Ap.* I, 143 (EUSEB. ARM. p. 23, 19 K; Synkell. p. 419, 7): καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα τὴν μὲν τῶν Χαλδαίων ἀναγραφὴν ἀξιόπιστον ἡγητέον· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ κἀν τοῖς ἀρχείοις τῶν Φοινίκων (794 F 1) σύμφωνα τοῖς ὑπὸ Βηρώσου (680 F 8a) λεγομένοις ἀναγέγραπται περὶ τοῦ τῶν Βαβυλωνίων βασιλέως, ὅτι καὶ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ τὴν Φοινίκην ἅπασαν ἐκεῖνος κατεστρέψατο. (144) περὶ τούτων γοῦν συμφωνεῖ καὶ Φιλόστρατος ἐν ταῖς 'Ιστορίαις, μεμνημένος τῆς Τύρου πολιορκίας, καὶ Μεγασθένης ἐν τῆι τετάρτηι(?) τῶν 'Ινδικῶν, δι' ἧς ἀποφαίνειν πειρᾶται 585/73

790. HERENNIUS PHILON VON BYBLOS

c. 54-142^{p}

T

1 (III 560) SUDA s.v. Φίλων Βύβλιος· γραμματικός. οὗτος γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τῶν ἐγγὺς Νέρωνος (54/68^{p}), καὶ παρέτεινεν εἰς μακρόν· ὕπατον γοῦν Σεβῆρον τὸν 'Ερέννιον χρηματίσαντα (c. 130^{p}?) αὐτὸς εἶναί φησιν (F 54), ὅταν ἦγεν η̄ καὶ ō ἔτος, ὀλυμπιάδι δὲ † κ̄ καὶ διακοσιοστῆι (101/4^{p}). γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῶι Περὶ κτήσεως καὶ ἐκλογῆς βιβλίων βιβλία ιβ̄· Περὶ πόλεων καὶ οὓς ἑκάστη αὐτῶν ἐνδόξους ἤνεγκε βιβλία λ̄· Περὶ τῆς βασιλείας 'Αδριανοῦ (ἐφ' οὗ καὶ ἦν ὁ Φίλων)· καὶ ἄλλα.

2 a) SUDA s.v. Ἕρμιππος Βηρύτιος· ἀπὸ κώμης μεσογαίου· μαθητὴς Φίλωνος τοῦ Βυβλίου, ὑφ' οὗ ᾠκειώθη 'Ερεννίωι Σευήρωι ἐπὶ 'Αδριανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως, ἔκδουλος ὢν γένος, λόγιος σφόδρα. καὶ ἔγραψε πολλά (IV). ἔγραψε καὶ Περὶ ὀνείρων. **b)** – s.v. Παῦλος Τύριος· ῥήτωρ, γεγονὼς κατὰ Φίλωνα τὸν Βύβλιον· ὃς ἐπὶ 'Αδριανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως πρεσβεύσας μητρόπολιν τὴν Τύρον ἐποίησεν. **c)** – s.v. 'Ηρωδιανὸς 'Αλεξανδρεύς· γραμματικός, υἱὸς 'Απολλωνίου ... τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Δυσκόλου. γέγονε κατὰ τὸν Καί-

---

2 ἰνδικαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ LVE ['Ινδικαῖς καὶ] Jac ἰδικαῖς καὶ Gutschmid 'Ιουδαικαῖς καὶ Cichorius · 2-3 φοινικικαῖς S^{c}P φοινικαῖς OLE Φοινικικαῖς ‹φησιν›? 3 τὴν om. LV 4 ἰθοβάλου ROLV *iothabulus* Lat; cf. 783 F 7 § 156 τύρων LV 6 ἀλλὰ Arm(?) ἅμα L 9 καὶ – ἅπασαν L Arm Συρίαν καὶ Αἴγυπτον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Φοινίκην Synk 10 Φιλ. ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις L *die geschichte des Philostratos, wo sie die belagerung von Tyros erwähnt* Arm Φιλ. ἐν ταῖς ἱ., ἔνθα καὶ περὶ τῆς Τύρου πολιορκίας καὶ τῶν Φοινίκων πάλαι, αἵτινες (παλαιαί τινες Gutschmid) ἱστορίαι φέρονται περὶ τοῦ Ναβουχοδονόσωρ Synk 11 τετάρτηι (δ) L Arm Synk δευτέραι Mue ᾱ Jac 15 βίβλιος AVFM^{ac} 15-21 οὗτος – ἄλλα om. F 16 τῶν om. AGM μακρόν (cf. s.v. 'Ερμογένης): Μάρκον Westermann 17-18 [αὐτὸς] – ὅταν ‹αὐτὸς› Mue 19 βιβλίων om. V 23 τοῦ βυβλίου om. (in lac.) A 'Ερεννίωι Kuester ἐρρενίωι o 24 ἔγραψε – ὀνείρων A^{mg}

XUM

σαρα 'Αντωνῖνον τὸν καὶ Μάρκον (161-180), ὡς νεώτερον εἶναι καὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ τὴν Μουσικὴν ἱστορίαν γράψαντος (IV) καὶ Φίλωνος τοῦ Βυβλίου.

3 Porphyr. *De abst.* 2, 56 (F 3a): ἡ Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία . . . ἣν Σαγχουνιάθων μὲν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώττηι συνέγραψεν, Φίλων δὲ ὁ Βύβλιος εἰς τὴν 'Ελλάδα γλῶσσαν δι' ὀκτὼ βιβλίων ἡρμήνευσεν. F 1 c. 9, 20/1.

4 Suda s.v. Σερῆνος· ὁ καὶ 'Αθηναῖος, ὁ Αἴλιος χρηματίσας· γραμματικός (s. II^{p}?). 'Επιτομὴν τῆς Φίλωνος πραγματείας Περὶ πόλεων καὶ τίνες ἐφ' ἑκάστης ἔνδοξοι, βιβλία γ̄. F 17-18.

F

1. ΦΟΙΝΙΚΙΚΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ Α̅ – Η̅(Θ)

(F 9-11? 30/2? 37/8? 41/2? 45? 55?).

Α̅

1 (1) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 9, 19: (14-18: die ältesten menschen kannten keine tempel, kultbilder, götter – ausser den gestirnen –, heroen, opfer usf.) ἡ γοῦν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἁπάντων πολύθεος πλάνη μακροῖς ὕστερον αἰῶσι πέφανται, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ Φοινίκων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων, διαβᾶσα δὲ ἐκ τούτων ἐπί τε τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη καὶ μέχρις αὐτῶν 'Ελλήνων, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν ἡ τῶν παλαιτάτων ἱστορία κατέχει, ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν ἐπισκέψασθαι καιρὸς ἀπὸ τῶν Φοινικικῶν ἀρξαμένους.

(20) ἱστορεῖ δὲ ταῦτα Σαγχουνιάθων, ἀνὴρ παλαίτατος καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν χρόνων, ὥς φασι, πρεσβύτερος, ὃν καὶ ἐπ' ἀκριβείαι καὶ ἀληθείαι τῆς Φοινικικῆς ἱστορίας ἀποδεχθῆναι μαρτυροῦσιν. Φίλων δὲ τούτου πᾶσαν τὴν συγγραφὴν – ὁ Βύβλιος, οὐχ ὁ 'Εβραῖος – μεταβαλὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Φοινίκων γλώττης ἐπὶ τὴν 'Ελλάδα φωνὴν ἐξέδωκε. (21) μέμνηται τούτων ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν πεποιημένος συσκευὴν ἐν τετάρτωι τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὑποθέσεως (Porphyrios 260 F 34), ὧδε τῶι ἀνδρὶ μαρτυρῶν πρὸς λέξιν· «ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ 'Ιουδαίων ἀληθέστατα, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς τόποις καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν αὐτῶν τὰ συμφωνότατα, Σαγχουνιάθων ὁ Βηρύτιος, εἰληφὼς τὰ ὑπομνήματα παρὰ

---

2 Βυβλίου Kuester βιβλίου AG(cp.) βίβλια V ἑβραίου B om. I 5 ὀκτώ: ἐννέα F 1 c. 9, 23 6 ὁ αἴλιος ὁ καὶ ἀθηναῖος Eudok ὁ καὶ Αἴλιος χρηματίσας, 'Αθηναῖος Bernhardy 7 ἀφ' Bernhardy 8 ἑκάστης πόλεως V 15-16 ἀρξαμένη – Αἰγυπτίων: cf. § 29; *P.E.* 1, 6, 1 16 δὲ A τε BO 17 τοῦτο A τούτων BO 18 φοινικικῶν B^1O φοινίκων A 19-26: F 2 § 42 19 δέ: δὴ A παλαιότατος A 20 πρεσβύτατος A 21 φοινικικῆς O φοινικῆς A^1B ἀποδειχθῆσα B^1 ἀποδειχθείση B^2 22 συγγραφὴν BO γραφὴν A 23 γλώττης A γλώσσης BO 24-p. 804, 12: Th(eodoret). *Graec. aff. cur.* 2, 44 f. 24-p. 804, 10 (βασιλίδος): Euseb. *P.E.* 10, 9, 11-16 (= Eus^2); stand bei Ph. nicht hier (s. zu F 9-11)? 24-26 (λέξιν): γράφει τοίνυν ἐν τῶι τετάρτωι τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν συσκευῆς ὁ Πορφύριος ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς τάδε Eus^2 26 δέ: δὴ Eus^2 (I) 28 σαγχωνιάθων Eus^2 (O) Th (stets)

XUM

'Ιερομβάλου τοῦ ἱερέως θεοῦ 'Ιευώ(?), ὃς 'Αβιβάλωι τῶι βασιλεῖ Βηρυτίων τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀναθεὶς ὑπ' ἐκείνου καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἐξεταστῶν τῆς ἀληθείας παρεδέχθη. οἱ δὲ τούτων χρόνοι καὶ πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν πίπτουσι χρόνων, καὶ σχεδὸν τοῖς Μωσέως πλησιάζουσιν, ὡς αἱ τῶν Φοινίκης βασιλέων μηνύουσι διαδοχαί. Σαγχουνιάθων δὲ ὁ κατὰ τὴν Φοινίκων διάλεκτον φιλαλήθως πᾶσαν τὴν παλαιὰν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναγραφῶν συναγαγὼν δὴ καὶ συγγράψας ἐπὶ Σεμιράμεως γέγονεν τῆς 'Ασσυρίων βασιλίδος, ἣ πρὸ τῶν 'Ιλιακῶν ἢ κατ' αὐτούς γε τοὺς χρόνους γενέσθαι ἀναγέγραπται. τὰ δὲ τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος εἰς 'Ελλάδα γλῶσσαν ἡρμήνευσεν Φίλων ὁ Βύβλιος. (22) ταῦτα μὲν ὁ δηλωθείς, ἀλήθειαν ὁμοῦ καὶ παλαιότητα τῶι δὴ θεολόγωι μαρτυρήσας· ὁ δὲ προιὼν οὐ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν οὐδὲ μὴν θεοὺς τοὺς κατ' οὐρανόν, θνητοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας, οὐδὲ τὸν τρόπον ἀστείους, οἵους δι' ἀρετὴν ἄξιον εἶναι ἀποδέξασθαι ἢ ζηλῶσαι τῆς φιλοσοφίας, φαυλότητος δὲ καὶ μοχθηρίας ἁπάσης κακίαν περιβεβλημένους θεολογεῖ· καὶ μαρτυρεῖ γε τούτους αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους εἶναι τοὺς εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν θεοὺς παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσιν νενομισμένους κατά τε τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰς χώρας. δέχου δὲ καὶ τούτων ἐκ τῶν ἐγγράφων τὰς ἀποδείξεις.

(23) ὁ δὴ Φίλων εἰς ἐννέα βίβλους τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος πραγματείαν διελὼν κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι προλέγει περὶ τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος ταῦτα· (24) «τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων ὁ Σαγχουνιάθων, ἀνὴρ πολυμαθὴς καὶ πολυπράγμων γενόμενος καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ πάντα συνέστη, παρὰ πάντων εἰδέναι ποθῶν, πολυφροντιστικῶς ἐξεμάστευσεν τὰ Taαύτου, εἰδὼς ὅτι τῶν ὑφ' ἥλιον γεγονότων πρῶτός ἐστι Τάαυτος ὁ τῶν γραμμάτων τὴν εὕρεσιν ἐπινοήσας καὶ τῆς τῶν ὑπομνημάτων γραφῆς κατάρξας καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὥσπερ κρηπῖδα βαλόμενος τοῦ λόγου, ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν ἐκάλεσαν Θωύθ, 'Αλεξανδρεῖς δὲ Θώθ, 'Ερμῆν δὲ Ἕλληνες μετέ-

---

1 ἱερομβαλίου B θεοῦ A θεοῦ τοῦ BO τοῦ θεοῦ Th ἰευώ BO Eus^2 ἰευ (so) A ἰαώ Th ἀβιβάλωι (cf. 783 F 1 § 117) A ἀβελβάλωι BO(Th) 'Αβεδβάλωι Nöldeke 3 ὑπεδέχθη O^{ac} ἀπεδέχθη? 6 δὲ ὁ Eus^2 Th δὲ Eus^1 7 τὴν ἱστ. τὴν παλαιὰν O 8 ἐν om. BO ἀναγραφῶν AEus^2 -γράφων B γραφῶν Th 9 δὴ A^3 δὲ A^{ac} om. B Eus^2 12 βίβλιος A 13 ὁ δὲ: Porphyrios? 14 τοὺς (καὶ B) κατ' οὐρανόν: cf. § 14 γυναῖκας – τρόπον om. B 16 γε AB καὶ O 17 εἶναι om. A θεοὺς BO οἵους A 18 ἐγγράφων A γραφῶν BO 19 ἐννέα: ὀκτὼ T 3; F 3a 22-p. 805, 16: cf. F 10 § 43 22 ἀνὴρ δὲ A ἀνὴρ δὴ Mras 24 πέρι πάντων N^{c}DV εἰδὼς B πολυφροντιστικῶς ν πολυφροντίστως Ddf 25-p. 805, 1 εἰδὼς – μετέφρασαν: F 2 § 14 25 τὰ τααύτου BO ταῦτα αὐτοῦ A cf. F 2 § 14 ὅτι BO τις A ἥλιον BO ἡλίωι A 26 ἐστι τάαυτος BO ἐστιν οὗτος A 28 βαλόμενος AB^2 βαλλ – B^{1}O 29 δὲ δεθωθ A

XUM

φρασαν». (25) ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐπιμέμφεται τοῖς νεωτέροις τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἂν βεβιασμένως καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῶς τοὺς περὶ θεῶν μύθους ἐπ' ἀλληγορίας καὶ φυσικὰς διηγήσεις τε καὶ θεωρίας ἀνάγουσι. λέγει δ'οὖν προιών· (26) «ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν νεώτεροι τῶν ἱερολόγων τὰ μὲν γεγονότα πράγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπεπέμψαντο, ἀλληγορίας δὲ καὶ μύθους ἐπινοήσαντες καὶ τοῖς κοσμικοῖς παθήμασι συγγένειαν πλασάμενοι μυστήρια κατέστησαν, καὶ πολὺν αὐτοῖς ἐπῆγον τῦφον, ὡς μὴ ῥαιδίως τινὰ συνορᾶν τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν γενόμενα· ὁ δὲ συμβαλὼν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων εὑρεθεῖσιν ἀποκρύφοις Ἀμμουνέων γράμμασι συγκειμένοις ἃ δὴ οὐκ ἦν πᾶσι γνώριμα, τὴν μάθησιν ἁπάντων αὐτὸς ἤσκησε, καὶ τέλος ἐπιθεὶς τῆι πραγματείαι τὸν κατ' ἀρχὰς μῦθον καὶ τὰς ἀλληγορίας ἐκποδὼν ποιησάμενος, ἐξηνύσατο τὴν πρόθεσιν, ἕως πάλιν οἱ ἐπιγενόμενοι ἱερεῖς χρόνοις ὕστερον ἠθέλησαν αὐτὴν ἀποκρύψαι καὶ εἰς τὸ μυθῶδες ἀποκαταστῆσαι, ἐξ οὗ τὸ μυστικὸν ἀνέκυπτεν οὐδέπω φθάσαν εἰς Ἕλληνας. (27) τούτοις ἑξῆς φησίν· «ταῦθ' ἡμῖν εὕρηται ἐπιμελῶς εἰδέναι τὰ Φοινίκων ποθοῦσι καὶ πολλὴν ἐξερευνησαμένοις ὕλην, οὐχὶ τὴν παρ' Ἕλλησι· διάφωνος γὰρ αὕτη καὶ φιλονεικότερον ὑπ' ἐνίων μᾶλλον ἢ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν συντεθεῖσα». (28) καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα· «οὕτως τε ἔχειν πεπεῖσθαι ἡμῖν παρέστη, ὡς ἐκεῖνος γέγραφε, τὴν διαφωνίαν ὁρῶσι τὴν παρ' Ἕλλησι, περὶ ἧς μοι τρία πεφιλοτίμηται βιβλία τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχοντα Παραδόξου ἱστορίας (F 12/3)». (29) καὶ αὖθις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει· «προδιαρθρῶσαι δὲ ἀναγκαῖον πρὸς τὴν αὖθ[illegible] σαφήνειαν καὶ τὴν τῶν κατὰ μέρος διάγνωσιν, ὅτι οἱ παλαίτατοι τῶν βαρβάρων, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ Φοίνικές τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, παρ' ὧν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ παρέλαβον ἄνθρωποι, θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον μεγίστους τοὺς τὰ πρὸς τὴν βιωτικὴν χρείαν εὑρόντας ἢ καὶ κατά τι εὖ ποιήσαντας τὰ

1-16: cf. F 2 § 39-41 1 τοῖς – ταῦτα BO τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα νεωτέροις A [τοῖς νεώτεροις] (doch s. lin. 13/6)? 2 καὶ (vor φυσικὰς) om. BO 4 νεώτεροι Jac -τατοι o 5 δὲ om. A 5-6 ἐπενοήσαντο BO 7 τῦφον A τὸν τῦφον BO 8 τινὰς A γινόμενα O ὁ δὲ: *i.e.* Sanchuniathon 8-25 συμβαλὼν – βαρβάρων om. B 9 ἀμμουνέων O -οῦνσων A -ναίων Mras 13 ἐπιγινόμενοι A 17 πολλὰ O 17-18 ἐξερευνησαμένους A 18 ὕλην, <πλὴν (o. ἀλλ')> οὐχὶ? 21 ἣν διαφωνίαν A 22 περὶ ἧς A παρ' οἷς O 24-p. 806, 5: cf. Theodoret. *Graec. aff. cur.* 3, 25: καὶ τὸν Κρόνον ἄνθρωπον εἶναι Σαγχωνιάθων ἔφησε καὶ γυναῖκα τὴν Ῥέαν τὴν ἐκείνου ὁμόζυγα, καὶ τὸν Δία καὶ τὴν Ἥραν ἐκείνων γε παῖδας, εἶτα εὐεργεσιῶν τινων ἄρξαντας καὶ δεξαμένους τοῦ βίου τὸ τέλος, θείας παρὰ Φοινίκων ἀξιωθῆναι τιμῆς, καὶ θεοὺς ἀναγορευθῆναι, καὶ βωμοῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἐτησίοις τιμηθῆναι δημοθοινίαις. 24 αὖθις O αὐτὴν A 25 παλαίτατοι A -ότατοι O 27 μεγίστους BO καὶ μέγιστον A τοὺς τὰ A τούς τί BO

XUM

ἔθνη· εὐεργέτας τε τούτους καὶ πολλῶν αἰτίους ἀγαθῶν ἡγούμενοι ὡς θεοὺς προσεκύνουν, καὶ εἰς τὸ χρεὼν μεταστάντας ναοὺς κατασκευασάμενοι στήλας τε καὶ ῥάβδους ἀφιέρουν ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν, καὶ ταῦτα μεγάλως σεβόμενοι καὶ ἑορτὰς ἔνεμον αὐτοῖς τὰς μεγίστας Φοίνικες, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σφετέρων βασιλέων τοῖς κοσμικοῖς στοιχείοις καί τισι τῶν νομιζομένων θεῶν τὰς ὀνομασίας ἐπέθεσαν· φυσικοὺς δὲ ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς πλανήτας ἀστέρας καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ τούτοις συναφῆ θεοὺς μόνους ἐγίνωσκον, ὥστ' αὐτοῖς τοὺς μὲν θνητοὺς τοὺς δὲ ἀθανάτους θεοὺς εἶναι».

2 (2) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 9, 30-10, 42: ταῦτα (F 1) κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον ὁ Φίλων διαστειλάμενος ἑξῆς ἀπάρχεται τῆς τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος ἑρμηνείας, ὧδέ πως τὴν Φοινικικὴν ἐκτιθέμενος θεολογίαν·

(10) τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεται ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη ἢ πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους καὶ χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβῶδες· ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἄπειρα καὶ διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. «ὅτε δέ» φησίν «ἠράσθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγκρασις, ἡ πλοκὴ ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη Πόθος· αὕτη δὲ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἁπάντων· αὐτὸ δὲ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε τὴν αὐτοῦ κτίσιν. καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ συμπλοκῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐγένετο Μώτ. τοῦτό τινές φασιν ἰλύν, οἱ δὲ ὑδατώδους μίξεως σῆψιν. καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐγένετο πᾶσα σπορὰ κτίσεως καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὅλων. (2) ἦν δέ τινα ζῶια οὐκ ἔχοντα αἴσθησιν, ἐξ ὧν ἐγένετο ζῶια νοερά· καὶ ἐκλήθη Ζοφασημίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐρανοῦ κατόπται. καὶ ἀνεπλάσθη ὁμοίως ὠιοῦ σχήματι. καὶ ἐξέλαμψε Μώτ, ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη ἀστέρες τε καὶ ἄστρα μεγάλα».

(3) τοιαύτη μὲν αὐτῶν ἡ κοσμογονία, ἄντικρυς ἀθεότητα εἰσάγουσα· ἴδωμεν δὲ ἑξῆς, ὡς καὶ τὴν ζωιογονίαν ὑποστῆναι λέγει. φησὶν οὖν· (4) «καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος διαυγάσαντος, διὰ πύρωσιν καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῆς γῆς ἐγένετο πνεύματα καὶ νέφη καὶ οὐρανίων ὑδάτων μέγισται καταφοραὶ καὶ χύσεις. καὶ ἐπειδὴ διεκρίθη καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου τόπου

---

2 μεταστάντας Wyttenbach καταστάντας ABO   3 κατασκευασάμενοι A μετασκ- BO   4 ταύτας BO   7 ἐπέθεσαν O προέθεσαν (-θέασαν A¹) Aᶜ ἐτίθεσαν B προσέθηκαν Mras   7-10: *P.E.* 1, 9, 5 ἔχεις δὲ καὶ ἐν τῆι Φοινικικῆι θεολογίαι, ὡς ἄρα Φοινίκων οἱ πρῶτοι φυσικοὶ ἥλιον – θεοὺς μόνους (A μόνον BO) ἐγίνωσκον (weiter zu p. 807, 11-14)   7 δὲ om. A   13 φοινικὴν A¹   15 ὑποτίθεται (*scil.* Σαγχουνιάθων) AB ὑποτίθενται O   16 ζοφώδη O   17 ὅτε AB ὅτι O   21 Μώτ om. A φασιν om. A   ὑδατώδη O   24 ζωφασημιν (so) A Ζωφησαμίν Clemen   24-25 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ O   26 σελήνη: μήνη B   27 αὐτῶι A   κοσμογένεια A¹   30 ὑδάτων om. BO

XUM

διεχωρίσθη διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου πύρωσιν, καὶ πάλιν συνήντησε πάντα ἐν ἀέρι τάδε τοῖσδε, καὶ συνέρραξαν, βρονταί τε ἀπετελέσθησαν καὶ ἀστραπαί, καὶ πρὸς τὸν πάταγον τῶν βροντῶν τὰ προγεγραμμένα νοερὰ ζῶια ἐγρηγόρησεν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἦχον ἐπτύρη, καὶ ἐκινήθη ἔν τε γῆι καὶ θαλάσσηι ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ».

(5) τοιαύτη αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ ζωιογονία. τούτοις ἑξῆς ὁ αὐτὸς συγγραφεὺς ἐπιφέρει λέγων· «ταῦθ' ηὑρέθη ἐν τῆι κοσμογονίαι γεγραμμένα Τααύτου καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου ὑπομνήμασιν ἔκ τε στοχασμῶν καὶ τεκμηρίων, ὧν ἑώρακεν αὐτοῦ ἡ διάνοια καὶ ηὗρε καὶ ἡμῖν ἐφώτισεν».

(6) ἑξῆς τούτοις ὀνόματα τῶν ἀνέμων εἰπὼν Νότου καὶ Βορέου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπιλέγει· «ἀλλ' οὗτοί γε πρῶτοι ἀφιέρωσαν τὰ τῆς γῆς βλαστήματα, καὶ θεοὺς ἐνόμισαν, καὶ προσεκύνουν ταῦτα, ἀφ' ὧν αὐτοί τε διεγένοντο καὶ οἱ ἑπόμενοι καὶ οἱ πρὸ αὐτῶν πάντες, καὶ χοὰς καὶ ἐπιθύσεις ἐποίουν». <ἔλεον δὲ καὶ οἶκτον καὶ κλαυθμὸν βλαστήματι γῆς ἀπιόντι καθιέρουν, καὶ γενέσει ζώιων ἐκ γῆς πρώτηι καὶ τῆι ἐξ ἀλλήλων καὶ τελευτῆι, καθ' ἣν τοῦ ζῆν ἀπήρχοντο>.» καὶ ἐπιλέγει· «αὗται δ' ἦσαν αἱ ἐπίνοιαι τῆς προσκυνήσεως ὅμοιαι τῆι αὐτῶν ἀσθενείαι καὶ ψυχῆς <ἔτι> ἀτολμίαι». (7) εἶτά φησι γεγενῆσθαι ἐκ τοῦ Κολπία ἀνέμου καὶ γυναικὸς Βάαυ (τοῦτο δὲ νύκτα ἑρμηνεύει) Αἰῶνα καὶ Πρωτόγονον θνητοὺς ἄνδρας οὕτω καλουμένους· εὑρεῖν δὲ τὸν Αἰῶνα τὴν ἀπὸ δένδρων τροφήν. ἐκ τούτων τοὺς γενομένους κληθῆναι Γένος καὶ Γενεάν, καὶ οἰκῆσαι τὴν Φοινίκην· αὐχμῶν δὲ γενομένων, τὰς χεῖρας ὀρέγειν εἰς οὐρανὸν πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον· «τοῦτον γάρ (φησίν) θεὸν ἐνόμιζον μόνον οὐρανοῦ κύριον Βεελσάμην καλοῦντες, ὅ ἐστι παρὰ Φοίνιξι κύριος οὐρανοῦ, Ζεὺς δὲ παρ' Ἕλλησιν». (8) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πλάνην Ἕλλησιν αἰτιᾶται λέγων· «οὐ γὰρ ματαίως αὐτὰ πολλαχῶς διεστειλάμεθα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς αὖθις παρεκδοχὰς τῶν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ὀνομάτων, ἅπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες

---

1 ἐχωρίσθη A 1-2 πάντα σ. πάλιν O 2 ἀέρι BO ἀκαρῆ A ἀκαρεῖ H^c 4 νοερὰ om. BO ἐγρηγόρησαν O 5 ἐπτύρη καὶ om. B 6 συγγραφεύς: *i.e.* Σαγχουνιάθων 7 ταaύτου BO τὰ αὐτοῦ A 8 ἐκείνου BO αὐτοῦ A 10 βορέα A 11-17 οὗτοι: *scil.* οἱ παλαίτατοι; cf. *P.E.* 1, 9, 5 (s. zu p. 806, 7-10 = Eus^2) καὶ ὅτι τούτοις οἱ παλαίτατοι τὰ (om. A) τῆς γῆς ἀφιέρωσαν βλαστήματα – ἀπήρχοντο. αὗται – ἀτολμίαι. ταῦτα καὶ ἡ Φοινίκων γραφή, ὡς ἑξῆς ἀποδειχθήσεται 13 αὐτοὶ καὶ Eus^2 (A) διεγίνοντο A Eus^2 14 ἐπιθύσεις Eus^2 (A) ἐποίουν: ἐτέλουν (ἐπε- O) Eus^2 14-17 ἔλεον – ἀπήρχοντο om. Eus^1 15 βλαστήματι BO καὶ βλαστήματα A 18 <ἔτι> Eus^2 20 βάαυ (Βάαυτ Bochart) τοῦτο BO βᾱ αὐτοῦ τι A θνητοὺς BO ητοὺς A 21 ἀπὸ τῶν BO 22 γενομένους A γεννωμένους BO (richtig?) κληθῆναι: καὶ A 23 ὀρέγειν εἰς οὐρανὸν B ὀρ. πρὸς οὐ. O εἰς οὐρανοὺς ὀρ. A 24 βεελσάμην A -μῆν BO; cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 1027 26 δὲ om. BO 27 αὖθις BO εὐθεῖς A

ἀγνοήσαντες ἄλλως ἐξεδέξαντο, πλανηθέντες τῆι ἀμφιβολίαι τῆς μεταφράσεως». (9) ἑξῆς φησιν ἀπὸ Γένους Αἰῶνος καὶ Πρωτογόνου γεννηθῆναι αὖθις παῖδας θνητούς, οἷς εἶναι ὀνόματα Φῶς καὶ Πῦρ καὶ Φλόξ· οὗτοι (φησίν) ἐκ παρατριβῆς ξύλων εὗρον πῦρ, καὶ τὴν χρῆσιν ἐδίδαξαν. υἱοὺς δὲ ἐγέννησαν οὗτοι μεγέθει τε καὶ ὑπεροχῆι κρείσσονας, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἐπετέθη ὧν ἐκράτησαν, ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν κληθῆναι τὸ Κάσσιον καὶ τὸν Λίβανον καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον καὶ τὸ Βραθύ. ἐκ τούτων (φησίν) ἐγεννήθη<σαν> Σαμημροῦμος, ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος, <καὶ Οὔσωος>· ἀπὸ μητέρων δὲ (φησίν) ἐχρημάτιζον, τῶν τότε γυναικῶν ἀνέδην μισγομένων οἷς ἂν ἐντύχοιεν. (10) εἶτά φησι τὸν Ὑψουράνιον οἰκῆσαι Τύρον, καλύβας τε ἐπινοῆσαι ἀπὸ καλάμων καὶ θρύων καὶ παπύρου· στασιάσαι δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Οὔσωον, ὃς σκέπην τῶι σώματι πρῶτος ἐκ δερμάτων ὧν ἴσχυσε συλλαβεῖν θηρίων εὗρε. ῥαγδαίων δὲ γενομένων ὄμβρων καὶ πνευμάτων, παρατριβέντα τὰ ἐν τῆι Τύρωι δένδρα πῦρ ἀνάψαι, καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ὕλην καταφλέξαι· δένδρου δὲ λαβόμενον τὸν Οὔσωον καὶ ἀποκλαδεύσαντα πρῶτον τολμῆσαι εἰς θάλασσαν ἐμβῆναι· ἀνιερῶσαι δὲ δύο στήλας Πυρὶ καὶ Πνεύματι, καὶ προσκυνῆσαι αἷμά τε σπένδειν αὐταῖς ἐξ ὧν ἤγρευε θηρίων. τούτων δὲ τελευτησάντων, τοὺς ἀπολειφθέντας φησὶ ῥάβδους αὐτοῖς ἀφιερῶσαι, καὶ τὰς στήλας προσκυνεῖν, καὶ τούτοις ἑορτὰς ἄγειν κατ' ἔτος. (11) χρόνοις δὲ ὕστερον πολλοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ὑψουρανίου γενεᾶς γενέσθαι Ἀγρέα καὶ Ἁλιέα τοὺς ἁλιείας καὶ ἄγρας εὑρετάς, ἐξ ὧν κληθῆναι ἀγρευτὰς καὶ ἁλιεῖς. ἐξ ὧν γενέσθαι δύο ἀδελφοὺς σιδήρου εὑρετὰς καὶ τῆς τούτου ἐργασίας, ὧν θάτερον τὸν Χουσὼρ λόγους ἀσκῆσαι καὶ ἐπωιδὰς καὶ μαντείας. εἶναι δὲ τοῦτον τὸν Ἥφαιστον, εὑρεῖν δὲ καὶ ἄγκιστρον καὶ δέλεαρ καὶ ὁρμιὰν καὶ σχεδίαν, πρῶτόν τε πάντων ἀνθρώπων πλεῦσαι. διὸ καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν μετὰ θάνατον ἐσεβάσθησαν. καλεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Δία Μειλίχιον· οἱ δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοίχους φασὶν ἐπινοῆσαι ἐκ πλίνθων. (12) μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκ τοῦ γένους τούτων γενέσθαι νεανίας δύο, καλεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν μὲν Τεχνίτην, τὸν δὲ Γήινον Αὐτόχθονα· οὗτοι ἐπενόησαν τῶι πηλῶι τῆς πλίνθου συμμιγνύειν

---

1 ἐξελέξαντο A 2 γένους Clemen, Mras 4 εὗρον ἐκ π. ξ. πῦρ A 6 κάσσιον BO κάσβιον A 7 καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον om. A 7-9 Ἀντιλίβανον – γυναικῶν om. B 7-8 ἐγεννήθησαν μημρουμος (so!) A ἐγεννήθη σαμημροῦμος O ἐγεννήθη Σαμηροῦμος Bochart 8 ὁ καὶ AO <καὶ Οὔσωος> Ddf 9 ἐχρημάτιζον τῶν B(?) O ἐχρηματίζοντο A ἀνέδην v ἀναίδην ABO ἂν om. A 10 τὸν – Τύρον om. B 11 θρίων B(?) παπύρου A -ρων BO οὔσωον AO οὔσων B 12 τῶι σώματι om. A πρῶτος A πρῶτον B om. O 14 αὐτῶν A αὐτόθι BO λαβομένου A Οὔσωον: οὔσωνα B^e 15 θάλατταν A 15-16 τε δύο A 20 ἁλιείας καὶ ἄγρας AB^c ἀγρείας καὶ ἄγρας O 21 ἐξ οὗ O 22 χουσὼρ BO(?) χρυσὼρ A: cf. 784 F 4 ἀσκήσεως A 23 εἶναι – ὀνομάζεται p. 809, 4 om. B εὑρεῖν δὲ (om. καὶ) ἄ. A 24 τε A δὲ O 25 δία μειλίχιον O διαμίχιον A 25-26 τὸν ἀδελφὸν Clemen 26 αὐτοῦ O αὐτῶν A 27 νεανίας O γενεὰς AH 28 συμμιγνύειν O -νυσιν A

φορυτόν, καὶ τῶι ἡλίωι αὐτὰς τερσαίνειν· ἀλλὰ καὶ στέγας ἐξεῦρον. ἀπὸ τούτων ἐγένοντο ἕτεροι, ὧν ὁ μὲν Ἀγρὸς ἐκαλεῖτο, ὁ δὲ Ἀγροῦ ἥρως ἢ Ἀγρότης, οὗ καὶ ξόανον εἶναι μάλα σεβάσμιον καὶ ναὸν ζυγοφορούμενον ἐν Φοινίκηι· παρὰ δὲ Βυβλίοις ἐξαιρέτως θεῶν ὁ μέγιστος ὀνομάζεται. (13) ἐπενόησαν δὲ οὗτοι αὐλὰς προστιθέναι τοῖς οἴκοις καὶ περιβόλους καὶ σπήλαια. ἐκ τούτων ἀγρόται καὶ κυνηγοί. οὗτοι δὲ καὶ Ἀλῆται καὶ Τιτᾶνες καλοῦνται. ἀπὸ τούτων γενέσθαι Ἄμυνον καὶ Μάγον, οἳ κατέδειξαν κώμας καὶ ποίμνας. ἀπὸ τούτων γενέσθαι Μισὼρ καὶ Συδύκ, τουτέστιν εὔλυτον καὶ δίκαιον. οὗτοι τὴν τοῦ ἁλὸς χρῆσιν εὗρον. (14) ἀπὸ Μισὼρ Τάαυτος, ὃς εὗρε τὴν τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων γραφήν, ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν Θωύθ, Ἀλεξανδρεῖς δὲ Θώθ, Ἕλληνες δὲ Ἑρμῆν ἐκάλεσαν. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Συδὺκ Διόσκουροι ἢ Κάβειροι ἢ Κορύβαντες ἢ Σαμοθρᾶικες· οὗτοι (φησί) πρῶτοι πλοῖον εὗρον. ἐκ τούτων γεγόνασιν ἕτεροι, οἳ καὶ βοτάνας εὗρον καὶ τὴν τῶν δακετῶν ἴασιν καὶ ἐπωιδάς.

(15) κατὰ τούτους γίνεταί τις Ἑλιοῦν καλούμενος Ὕψιστος καὶ θήλεια λεγομένη Βηρούθ, οἳ καὶ κατῴκουν περὶ Βύβλον. ἐξ ὧν γεννᾶται Ἐπίγειος Αὐτόχθων, ὃν ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν Οὐρανόν, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς στοιχεῖον δι' ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ κάλλους ὀνομάζειν οὐρανόν. γεννᾶται δὲ τούτωι ἀδελφὴ ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων, ἣ καὶ ἐκλήθη Γῆ· καὶ διὰ τὸ κάλλος ἀπ' αὐτῆς (φησίν) ἐκάλεσαν τὴν ὁμώνυμον γῆν. ὁ δὲ τούτων πατὴρ ὁ Ὕψιστος ἐν συμβολῆι θηρίων(?) τελευτήσας ἀφιερώθη, ὧι χοὰς καὶ θυσίας οἱ παῖδες ἐτέλεσαν. (16) παραλαβὼν δὲ ὁ Οὐρανὸς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρχὴν ἄγεται πρὸς γάμον τὴν ἀδελφὴν Γῆν, καὶ ποιεῖται ἐξ αὐτῆς παῖδας τέσσαρας· Ἦλον τὸν καὶ Κρόνον καὶ Βαίτυλον καὶ Δαγὼν (ὅς ἐστι Σίτων) καὶ Ἄτλαντα. καὶ ἐξ ἄλλων δὲ γαμετῶν ὁ Οὐρανὸς πολλὴν ἔσχε γενεάν· διὸ χαλεπαίνουσα ἡ Γῆ τὸν Οὐρανὸν ζηλοτυποῦσα ἐκάκιζεν, ὡς καὶ διαστῆναι ἀλλήλων. (17) ὁ δὲ Οὐρανὸς ἀποχωρήσας αὐτῆς, μετὰ βίας ὅτε καὶ ἐβούλετο ἐπιὼν καὶ πλησιάζων αὐτῆι,

---

2 ἀγροῦ ἥρως AO ἀγρούηρως NV (v vor Mras) ἀγρότης O ἀβρότης A 4 βιβλίοις A 5 περιβόλους AO -λαια B 7 ποίμνας A ποίμνια B (O fehlt) 8 μισὼρ A μείσωρα B (O unleserlich) συδύκ A συδὲκ G (O unleserlich) σεδὲκ B; cf. § 25; 38 9 μισὼρ A μείσωρ B G (O zerstört) 9-11 Τάαυτος – ἐκάλεσαν: F 1 § 24 9 οὐ τάαυτος BO οὗτος αὐτὸς A ὁ Τάαυτος Mras οὖν T.? s. zu p. 804, 25 10 θωύθ A θωὼρ BO ἀλ. δὲ θώθ BO om. A 11 τοῦ om. A συδὺκ A συδὲκ BO κάβιροι A κορύβαντες A κύρβαντες BO (richtig?) 13 δακετῶν AB δεκάτων O 14 ἐλιοῦν A ἐλιούμ (ἐλ- V) O (N) ἐνούμ B 15 βηρούθ BO ῥουθ A βίβλον A βέβλον B^1 15-16 ἐπίγειος αὐτόχθων (cf. § 12) A ἐπ. ἢ αὐ. BO 16-17: ὃν ὕστερον ‹δι' ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ κάλλους› ἐκ. Οὐρανόν, ὡς – στοιχεῖον [δι' ὑ.τ.κ.] ὀνομάζειν οὐρανόν? τοῦ περὶ ἡμᾶς στοιχείου A^1 18 ἀπ' αὐτῆς BO αὐτῆς A 19-20 ἐν συμβολῆι A ἐν (ἐκ B^2) συμβολῆς B ἐν συμβολαῖς O 20 θηρίων BO αιψριων (so) A οἱ om. B (O unleserlich) 21 ἄγε' B^2 22 ἦλον A ἶλον BO 23 βαίτυλον O βέτυλον B β . . τυλον (rasur) A 23-24 γαμετῶν BO γενετῶν A 25 ἐκάκιζεν BO κακίζειν A κακίζει Mras 26 ἐπιὼν A°O ἐστιῶν B^1 ἐστιῶν B^2

XUM

14

πάλιν ἀπηλλάττετο· ἐπιχειρεῖν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς παῖδας διαφθείρειν, τὴν δὲ Γῆν ἀμύνασθαι πολλάκις, συμμαχίαν αὐτῆι συλλεξαμένην. εἰς ἄνδρας δὲ προελθὼν ὁ Κρόνος, Ἑρμῆι τῶι τρισμεγίστωι συμβούλωι καὶ βοηθῶι χρώμενος – οὗτος γὰρ ἦν αὐτῶι γραμματεύς – τὸν πατέρα Οὐρανὸν ἀμύνεται τιμωρῶν τῆι μητρί. (18) Κρόνωι δὲ γίνονται παῖδες Περσεφόνη καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ. ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη παρθένος ἐτελεύτα, τῆς δὲ Ἀθηνᾶς γνώμηι καὶ Ἑρμοῦ κατεσκεύασε Κρόνος ἐκ σιδήρου ἅρπην καὶ δόρυ. εἶτα ὁ Ἑρμῆς τοῖς τοῦ Κρόνου συμμάχοις λόγους μαγείας διαλεχθεὶς πόθον ἐνεποίησε τῆς κατὰ τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ μάχης ὑπὲρ τῆς Γῆς· καὶ οὕτως Κρόνος τὸν Οὐρανὸν πολέμωι συμβαλὼν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἤλασε, καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν διεδέξατο. ἑάλω δὲ ἐν τῆι μάχηι καὶ ἡ ἐπέραστος τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ σύγκοιτος ἐγκύμων οὖσα, ἣν ἐκδίδωσιν ὁ Κρόνος Δαγῶνι πρὸς γάμον· τίκτει δὲ παρὰ τούτωι ὃ κατὰ γαστρὸς ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ ἔφερεν, ὃ καὶ ἐκάλεσε Δημαροῦν. (19) ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Κρόνος τεῖχος περιβάλλει τῆι ἑαυτοῦ οἰκήσει, καὶ πόλιν πρώτην κτίζει τὴν ἐπὶ Φοινίκης Βύβλον. (20) μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Ἄτλαντα ὑπονοήσας ὁ Κρόνος μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ εἰς βάθος γῆς ἐμβαλὼν κατέχωσε. κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Διοσκούρων σχεδίας καὶ πλοῖα συνθέντες ἔπλευσαν, καὶ ἐκριφέντες κατὰ τὸ Κάσσιον ὄρος ναὸν αὐτόθι ἀφιέρωσαν. οἱ δὲ σύμμαχοι Ἤλου τοῦ Κρόνου Ἐλωεὶμ ἐπεκλήθησαν, ὡς ἂν Κρόνιοι οὗτοι ἦσαν οἱ λεγόμενοι ἐπὶ Κρόνου. (21) Κρόνος δὲ υἱὸν ἔχων Σάδιδον ἰδίωι αὐτὸν σιδήρωι διεχρήσατο δι' ὑπονοίας αὐτὸν ἐσχηκώς, καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτόχειρ τοῦ παιδὸς γενόμενος ἐστέρησεν· ὡσαύτως καὶ θυγατρὸς ἰδίας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπέτεμεν, ὡς πάντας ἐκπεπλῆχθαι θεοὺς τὴν Κρόνου γνώμην. (22) χρόνου δὲ προιόντος Οὐρανὸς ἐν φυγῆι τυγχάνων θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ παρθένον Ἀστάρτην μεθ' ἑτέρων ἀδελφῶν αὐτῆς δύο Ῥέας καὶ Διώνης, δόλωι τὸν Κρόνον ἀνελεῖν ὑποπέμπει, ἃς καὶ ἑλὼν ὁ Κρόνος κουριδίας γαμετὰς ἀδελφὰς οὔσας ἐποιήσατο. (23) γνοὺς δὲ Οὐρανὸς ἐπιστρατεύει κατὰ τοῦ Κρόνου Εἱμαρμένην καὶ Ὥραν μεθ' ἑτέρων συμμάχων, καὶ ταύτας ἐξοικειωσάμενος ὁ Κρόνος παρ' ἑαυτῶι κατέσχεν. ἔτι δὲ (φησίν) ἐπενόησε θεὸς Οὐρανὸς βαιτύλια, λίθους ἐμψύχους μηχανησάμενος. (24) Κρόνωι δὲ ἐγένοντο ἀπὸ

---

1 ἀπηλλάσσετο A ἐπιχειρεῖν A ἐπεχείρει BO 2 αὐτῆι O 3 ἑρμεῖ A 4 αὐτῶι AO αὐτοῦ B ἀμύνεται om. A 6 οὖν om. O τελευτᾶι A Ἀθηνᾶς – Ἑρμοῦ BO μετὰ γνώμης καὶ μετὰ ἑρμοῦ A 8 πότον B τοῖς κατὰ B κατὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ A κατ' οὐρανὸν BO 9 ὑπὲρ γῆς A οὕτω(ς) B(O) οὗτος A πολεμῶν A 10 ἑάλω δὲ καὶ ἐν τ.μ. A 11-12 δαγῶνι πρὸς γάμον A πρὸς (εἰς O) γάμον τῶ δαγὼν BO 13 δημαροῦν BIO διμάρουν A; cf. § 27/8; 31 τῆι om. O 14 πόλιν πρώτην A πρ. π. BO φοινίκης A -κη BO βύβλον O βίβλον A βέβλον B 17 συνθέντες AB σύνθετα O κατὰ BO περὶ A 18-23 οἱ δὲ – γνώμην om. B 18 ἥλου A ἴλου O ἐλωεὶμ ἐπεκλήθησαν O ἐλωι μετεβλήθησαν A 19 ἦσαν εἴησαν Schwartz 21 γινόμενος A 22 ἐκπεπλῆσθαι A κρόνου A χρόνου BO 24 ῥέα(ν) καὶ διώνη(ν) A^{c} (m. 1) 27-28 οἰκειωσάμενος B 28 ὁ om. A

XUM

Ἀστάρτης θυγατέρες ἑπτὰ Τιτανίδες ἢ Ἀρτέμιδες. καὶ πάλιν τῶι αὐτῶι γίνονται ἀπὸ Ῥέας παῖδες ἑπτά, ὧν ὁ νεώτατος ἅμα τῆι γενέσει ἀφιερώθη· καὶ ἀπὸ Διώνης θήλειαι * *, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἀστάρτης πάλιν ἄρρενες δύο, Πόθος καὶ Ἔρως. (25) ὁ δὲ Δαγὼν ἐπειδὴ εὗρε σῖτον καὶ ἄροτρον, ἐκλήθη Ζεὺς Ἀρότριος. Συδύκωι δὲ τῶι λεγομένωι δικαίωι μία τῶν Τιτανίδων συνελθοῦσα γεννᾶι τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν. (26) ἐγεννήθησαν δὲ καὶ ἐν Περαίαι Κρόνωι τρεῖς παῖδες, Κρόνος ὁμώνυμος τῶι πατρὶ καὶ Ζεὺς Βῆλος καὶ Ἀπόλλων. κατὰ τούτους γίνονται Πόντος καὶ Τυφὼν καὶ Νηρεὺς πατὴρ Πόντου, Βήλου δὲ παῖς. (27) ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Πόντου γίνεται Σιδών, ἣ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εὐφωνίας πρώτη ὕμνον ὠιδῆς εὗρε, καὶ Ποσειδῶν. τῶι δὲ Δημαροῦντι γίνεται Μέλκαθρος ὁ καὶ Ἡρακλῆς. (28) εἶτα πάλιν Οὐρανὸς πολεμεῖ Πόντωι, καὶ ἀποστὰς Δημαροῦντι † προστίθεται ἔπεισί τε Πόντωι ὁ Δημαροῦς, τροποῦται δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Πόντος· ὁ δὲ Δημαροῦς φυγῆς θυσίαν ηὔξατο. (29) ἔτει δὲ τριακοστῶι δευτέρωι τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κρατήσεως καὶ βασιλείας ὁ Ἦλος (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὁ Κρόνος) Οὐρανὸν τὸν πατέρα λοχήσας ἐν τόπωι τινὶ μεσογείωι καὶ λαβὼν ὑποχείριον ἐκτέμνει αὐτοῦ τὰ αἰδοῖα σύνεγγυς πηγῶν τε καὶ ποταμῶν, ἔνθα ἀφιερώθη Οὐρανός, καὶ ἀπηρτίσθη αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀπέσταξεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα τῶν αἰδοίων εἰς τὰς πηγὰς καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν τὰ ὕδατα· καὶ μέχρι τούτου δείκνυται τὸ χωρίον.

(30) τοσαῦτα μὲν δὴ τὰ τοῦ Κρόνου, καὶ τοιαῦτά γε τὰ σεμνὰ τοῦ παρ' Ἕλλησι βοωμένου βίου τῶν ἐπὶ Κρόνου, οὓς καί φασι γεγονέναι πρῶτον χρύσεόν τε γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, τῆς μακαριζομένης ἐκείνης τῶν παλαιῶν εὐδαιμονίας. πάλιν δὲ ὁ συγγραφεὺς τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

(31) «Ἀστάρτη δὲ ἡ μεγίστη καὶ Ζεὺς Δημαροῦς καὶ Ἅδωδος βασιλεὺς θεῶν ἐβασίλευον τῆς χώρας Κρόνου γνώμηι. ἡ δὲ Ἀστάρτη ἐπέθηκε τῆι ἰδίαι κεφαλῆι βασιλείας παράσημον

1-2 θυγατέρας – Ῥέας om. BO 3 * * (zahl und namen?) Jac 5 συδύκωι A συδὲκ O σεδὲκ B; cf. § 13 6 περαίαι A (Steph. Byz. s.v.?) τῆι περαίαι BO 7 Ζεὺς Βῆλος: *P.E.* 3, 10, 20 Φοινίκων μὲν οὖν οἱ πρῶτοι θεολόγοι, ὡς ἐν τῶι πρώτωι συγγράμματι παρεστήσαμεν, τὸν Δία παῖδα Κρόνου θνητὸν ἀπὸ θνητοῦ γενόμενον, ἄνδρα Φοίνικα τὸ γένος, ἀπεμνημόνευον 8 βήλου δὲ παῖς A om. BO 9 σιδών, ἣ BO σιδώνη A 10 διμαροῦντι (auch v. 11/2) A μέλκαθρος A μέλκαρθος BO 11-12 ἀποστὰς Δημαροῦς (αὐτῶι)? 12-13 ἔπεισί – Πόντος om. A 13 δὲ A τε BO διμαροῦς A 13 ηὔξαντο O ἔτει AB^2 ἔτι B^1O 14 Ἦλος BO 15 περιτέμνει λοχήσας A 15-16 μεσογείωι – αὐτοῦ om. A περιτέμνει λοχήσας ἐν τόπωι τινὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα AH 17 πνεῦμα A αἷμα BGDV (O unleserlich) 20-23 εὐδαιμονίας: zusammenfassung eher Eusebs als Ph.s (s. § 20) 20 τὰ τοῦ: τοῦ om. A 20-21 τὰ σεμνὰ – κρόνου A τὰ παρ' – κρόνου τὰ σεμνὰ O τὰ παρ' – τοῦ ἐπὶ Κρόνου τὰ σεμνὰ B 21 οὓς om. A 22 τῶν παλ. ἐκείνης B 23 δὲ A om. BO ὁ συγγραφεύς: Philon? τούτοις om. B ἐπιφέρει μεθ' ἕτ. B 24 καὶ ζεὺς δημαροῦς BO καὶ ζεύς· καὶ διμάρους A <[illegible] καὶ Ἅδωδος Gruppe

XUM

κεφαλὴν ταύρου· περινοστοῦσα δὲ τὴν οἰκουμένην εὗρεν ἀεροπετῆ ἀστέρα, ὃν καὶ ἀνελομένη ἐν Τύρωι τῆι ἁγίαι νήσωι ἀφιέρωσε. τὴν δὲ Ἀστάρτην Φοίνικες τὴν Ἀφροδίτην εἶναι λέγουσι. (32) καὶ ὁ Κρόνος δὲ περιιὼν τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι ἑαυτοῦ θυγατρὶ δίδωσι τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὴν βασιλείαν. (33) λοιμοῦ δὲ γενομένου καὶ φθορᾶς, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μονογενῆ υἱὸν * * ὁ Κρόνος Οὐρανῶι τῶι πατρὶ ὁλοκαρποῖ, καὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα F 3; 10 περιτέμνεται, ταὐτὸν ποιῆσαι καὶ τοὺς ἅμ' αὐτῶι συμμάχους ἐξαναγκάσας. (34) καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ ἕτερον αὐτοῦ παῖδα ἀπὸ Ῥέας ὀνομαζόμενον Μοὺθ ἀποθανόντα ἀφιεροῖ· Θάνατον δὲ τοῦτον καὶ Πλούτωνα Φοίνικες ὀνομάζουσι. (35) καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Κρόνος Βύβλον μὲν τὴν πόλιν θεᾶι Βααλτίδι τῆι καὶ Διώνηι δίδωσι, Βηρυτὸν δὲ Ποσειδῶνι καὶ Καβείροις Ἀγρόταις τε καὶ Ἁλιεῦσιν, οἳ καὶ τὰ τοῦ Πόντου λείψανα εἰς τὴν Βηρυτὸν ἀφιέρωσαν. (36) πρὸ δὲ τούτων θεὸς Τάαυτος μιμησάμενος τῶν συνόντων(?) θεῶν ὄψεις, Κρόνου τε καὶ Δαγῶνος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, διετύπωσεν τοὺς ἱεροὺς τῶν στοιχείων χαρακτῆρας. F 4 ἐπενόησε δὲ καὶ τῶι Κρόνωι παράσημα βασιλείας ὄμματα τέσσαρα ἐκ τῶν ἐμπροσθίων καὶ ὀπισθίων μερῶν, ‹δύο μὲν ἐγρηγορότα›, δύο δὲ ἡσυχῆ μύοντα· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων πτερὰ τέσσαρα, δύο μὲν ὡς ἱπτάμενα, δύο δὲ ὡς ὑφειμένα. (37) τὸ δὲ σύμβολον ἦν, ἐπειδὴ Κρόνος κοιμώμενος ἔβλεπε, καὶ ἐγρηγορῶς ἐκοιμᾶτο· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πτερῶν ὁμοίως, ὅτι ἀναπαυόμενος ἵπτατο, καὶ ἱπτάμενος ἀνεπαύετο. τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς θεοῖς δύο ἑκάστωι πτερώματα ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, ὡς ὅτι δὴ συνίπταντο τῶι Κρόνωι· καὶ αὐτῶι δὲ πάλιν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς πτερὰ δύο, ἓν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμονικωτάτου νοῦ καὶ ἓν ἐπὶ τῆς αἰσθήσεως. (38) ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Κρόνος εἰς νότου χώραν ἅπασαν τὴν Αἴγυπτον παρέδωκε θεῶι Τααύτωι, ὅπως βασίλειον αὐτῶι γένηται. ταῦτα δὲ (φησί)

---

2 ἀστέρα om. B 3-17 τὴν δὲ – χαρακτῆρας om. B 7 * *: ἐξ ἐπιχωρίας νύμφης Ἀνωβρὲτ (F 3b)? 'ex legitima uxore' Mue ὁλοκαυτοῖ Mue 8 ταυτὸν A ταυτὸ O 9 ἐξαναγκάσας A καταν- O 10 ἀφιεροῖ O ἱεροῖ A 12 βίβλον A 13 διώνηι (cf. § 22) A διώδη O ποσειδῶνι A ποσειδῶν O καβήροις A 15 τάαυτος O ταῦθ' ὃς A; cf. F 1 § 23; F 2 § 14; 38; F 4 § 53; F 10 15-16 τῶν συνόντων θ. ὄψεις O τὸν οὐρανὸν τῶν θεῶν ὄψει A τῶν οὐρανοέντων (o. οὐρανιώνων) ὄ.? Mue τῶν τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐχόντων θ.ὄ.? 16 δαγῶνος A δαγὼν O 18 καὶ om. B 19-20 ‹δ. μ. ἐ.› Jac ‹δύο μὲν *› Gaisford ‹δ. μ. ἀτενὲς βλέποντα› Mras 20 μύοντα BO νεύοντα A 21 ἱπτάμενα A, -μένου BO ὡς om. A 23 ὅτι BO ἔτι A 24 ἵπταται B δύο ‹ἦν›? 25 συνίπτανται B 28 παρέδωκεν A ἔδωκε BO 29 τααύτωι BO ταυθω (so) A

XUM

πρῶτοι πάντων ὑπεμνηματίσαντο οἱ ἑπτὰ Συδὲκ παῖδες Κάβειροι καὶ ὁ ὄγδοος αὐτῶν ἀδελφὸς Ἀσκληπιός, ὡς αὐτοῖς ἐνετείλατο θεὸς Τάαυτος.

(39) ταῦτα πάντα ὁ Θαβίων, ὃς πάμπρωτος τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος γεγονότων Φοινίκων ἱεροφάντης ἀλληγορήσας τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν ἀναμίξας, παρέδωκε τοῖς ὀργεῶσι καὶ τελετῶν κατάρχουσι προφήταις· οἱ δὲ τὸν τῦφον αὔξειν ἐκ παντὸς ἐπινοοῦντες τοῖς αὐτῶν διαδόχοις παρέδοσαν καὶ τοῖς ἐπεισάκτοις, ὧν ἦν καὶ Εἰσίριος ‹ὁ› τῶν τριῶν γραμμάτων εὑρετής, ἀδελφὸς Χνᾶ τοῦ πρώτου μετονομασθέντος Φοίνικος».

(40) εἶθ᾽ ἑξῆς αὖθις ἐπιλέγει· «οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες εὐφυίαι πάντας ὑπερβαλλόμενοι τὰ μὲν πρῶτα πλεῖστα ἐξιδιώσαντο, εἶτα καὶ τοῖς προκοσμήμασι ποικίλως ἐξετραγώιδησαν, ταῖς τε τῶν μύθων ἡδοναῖς θέλγειν ἐπινοοῦντες παντοίως ἐποίκιλλον. ἔνθεν Ἡσίοδος οἵ τε κυκλικοὶ περιηχημένοι Θεογονίας καὶ Γιγαντομαχίας καὶ Τιτανομαχίας ἔπλασαν ἰδίας καὶ ἐκτομάς, οἷς συμπεριφερόμενοι ἐξενίκησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. (41) σύντροφοι δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνων πλάσμασιν αἱ ἀκοαὶ ἡμῶν γενόμεναι καὶ προληφθεῖσαι πολλοῖς αἰῶσιν ὡς παρακαταθήκην φυλάσσουσιν ἥνπερ ἐδέξαντο μυθοποιίαν, καθάπερ καὶ ἀρχόμενος εἶπον, ἥτις συνεργηθεῖσα χρόνωι δυσεξίτητον αὐτῆς τὴν κατοχὴν ἀπείργασται, ὥστε τὴν μὲν ἀλήθειαν δοκεῖν λῆρον, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀφηγήσεως νόθον ἀλήθειαν».

(42) ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῆς Σαγχουνιάθωνος προκείσθω γραφῆς, ἑρμηνευθείσης μὲν ὑπὸ Φίλωνος τοῦ Βυβλίου, δοκιμασθείσης δὲ ὡς ἀληθοῦς ὑπὸ τῆς Πορφυρίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου μαρτυρίας (F 1 § 21; es folgt F 10).

3 (3-4) a) Porphyr. *De abst.* 2, 56 (Euseb. *P.E.* 4, 16, 6): Φοίνικες δὲ ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς ἢ πολέμων ἢ αὐχμῶν ἢ λοιμῶν ἔθυον τῶν φιλτάτων τινά, ἐπιφημίζοντες Κρόνωι· καὶ πλήρης δὲ ἡ Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία

F 2 § 33; F 10

---

1 ὑπεμνηματίσαντο A ἀπ- BO   συδὲκ BO σύδου A Συδύκου Mras; cf. § 25   1-2 κάβηροι A   2 ὄγδοος BO ἴδιος A   3 τάαυτος BO ταυθός A   4-22: F 1 § 25/8   4 θαβίων, ὃς πάμπρωτος A θαυίωνος παῖς πρῶτος BO   6 ὀργεῶσι BO ὀργαιῶσι A   7-25 οἱ δὲ – μαρτυρίας om. B   τοῖς αὐτῶν διαδόχοις (cf. F 1 § 26) v ταῖς αὐ. διαδοχαῖς AO (Mras)   9 ἦν A εἰς ἔτι O   εἰσίριος A ἴσιρις O   ‹ὁ› Jac   γραμμάτων O -τέων A   10 πρώτου O om. A   11 ἐπιλέγει: *i.e.* Philon   12 εἶτα om. A   καὶ om. O   13 τε om. O   17 δὲ om. O   19 ἥνπερ ἐδέξαντο A ἣν παρεδέξαντο O   20 εἶπον O εἶπεν A   21 δυσεξίτηλον? Mras   ἀπείργασται A εἴργασται O   23-25: F 1 § 20   23 προσκείσθω O   24 βιβλίου A   ἀληθοῦς Vigier -θῶς o   27 ἢ λ. ἢ αὐ. Eus   ἔθυον Eus ἐθύοντο Porph   28 ἐπιφημίζοντες Lobeck ἐπιψηφίζοντες Porph Eus   τῶι κρόνωι Eus (O)   πλήρης δὲ Porph π. γε (τε BO) Eus

XUM

τῶν θυσάντων, ἣν Σαγχουνιάθων μὲν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώττηι συνέγραψεν, Φίλων δὲ ὁ Βύβλιος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν δι' ὀκτὼ βιβλίων ἡρμήνευσεν. **b)** Euseb. *P.E.* 4, 16, 11: ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῆς προδηλωθείσης κείσθω γραφῆς (*scil.* τοῦ Πορφυρίου). ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος τῆς Φίλωνος Φοινικικῆς ἱστορίας παραθήσομαι ταῦτα· «ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς τῶν κινδύνων ἀντὶ τῆς πάντων φθορᾶς τὸ ἠγαπημένον τῶν τέκνων τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἢ πόλεως ἢ ἔθνους εἰς σφαγὴν ἐπιδιδόναι λύτρον τοῖς τιμωροῖς δαίμοσι· κατεσφάττοντο δὲ οἱ διδόμενοι μυστικῶς. Κρόνος τοίνυν, ὃν οἱ Φοίνικες Ἦλ προσαγορεύουσιν, βασιλεύων τῆς χώρας καὶ ὕστερον μετὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτὴν εἰς τὸν τοῦ Κρόνου ἀστέρα καθιερωθείς, ἐξ ἐπιχωρίας νύμφης Ἀνωβρὲτ λεγομένης υἱὸν ἔχων μονογενῆ, ὃν διὰ τοῦτο Ἰεοὺδ ἐκάλουν (τοῦ μονογενοῦς οὕτως ἔτι καὶ νῦν καλουμένου παρὰ τοῖς Φοίνιξι) κινδύνων ἐκ πολέμου μεγίστων κατειληφότων τὴν χώραν, βασιλικῶι κοσμήσας σχήματι τὸν υἱὸν βωμόν τε κατασκευασάμενος κατέθυσεν».

*4 (9) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 10, 45: (F 10) ὁ δ' αὐτὸς πάλιν περὶ τῶν Φοινίκων F 2 § 14?
στοιχείων ἐκ τῶν Σαγχουνιάθωνος μεταβάλλων θέα(?) ὁποῖά φησι περὶ τῶν ἑρπυστικῶν καὶ ἰοβόλων θηρίων, ἃ δὴ χρῆσιν μὲν ἀγαθὴν ἀνθρώποις οὐδεμίαν συντελεῖ, φθορὰν δὲ καὶ λύμην οἷς ἂν τὸν δυσαλθῆ καὶ χαλεπὸν ἰὸν ἐγχρίμψειεν ἀπεργάζεται. γράφει δὲ καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς λέξιν ὧδέ πως λέγων·

(46) «τὴν μὲν οὖν τοῦ δράκοντος φύσιν καὶ τῶν ὄφεων αὐτὸς ἐξεθείασεν ὁ Τάαυτος, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν αὖθις Φοίνικές τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι· πνευματικώτατον γὰρ τὸ ζῶιον πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν καὶ πυρῶδες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ παρεδόθη· παρ' ὃ καὶ τάχος ἀνυπέρβλητον διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος παρίστησι, χωρὶς ποδῶν τε καὶ χειρῶν ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν ἔκτοσθεν, δι' ὧν τὰ λοιπὰ ζῶια τὰς κινήσεις

---

1 σαγχωνιάθων Eus (BO) γλώττηι Porph Eus (A) γλώσσηι Eus (BO) 2-3 Φίλων – ἡρμήνευσεν om. Eus (B) 2 βίβλιος Eus (A) 2-3 δι' ὀκτὼ βιβλίων Porph Eus (διὸ ἐκ τῶν A); cf. F 1 § 23 2 γλῶσσαν Porph Eus 3 οὖν om. O 5 φοινικῆς A 9 τιμωροῖς A πονηροῖς O κατέσφαττον τότε A 10 ἦλ O ι̅η̅λ̅ (*i.e.* Ἰσραήλ) A (1, 10, 44 = F 10: ἦλ A ἰσραὴλ BGNV; O fehlt) 13 ἀνοβρὲτ O ἄνωβριν 1, 10, 44 (A) τὸν διὰ τοῦτον A ἰεοὺδ D, Eissfeldt ἰού̅ε̅ο̅υ̅τ A ἰεδοὺδ N (1, 10, 44: ἰδοῦδ A ἰροὺδ BO ἰεροὺδ N) 14 καὶ νῦν ἔτι O 15 κινδ. – μεγίστων: s. F 2 § 33 16 χώραν: πόλιν 1, 10, 44 (BO) 18-p. 816, 12: nach Gruppe *Griech. Kulte u. Mythen* I p. 367 ff. 'interpolation' aus einem 'allegorisierenden philosophen'; s. Komm. 18 αὐτὸς: d.i. Philon φοινικικοὺς O 19 μεταβάλλων A -αλὼν BO 21-22 ἐγχρίμψειεν A -ρίψ- BO 22 πως AB πῃ O 24 (p. 815, 6) τάαυτος BO ταυθὸς A 25 τῶν om. A 26 παρ' ὧι BO 28 ἔκτοσθεν Gaisford, Ddf ἔκτοθεν A ἔξωθεν BO δι' ὧν A ἐξ ὧν BO

XUM

ποιεῖται· καὶ ποικίλων σχημάτων τύπους ἀποτελεῖ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν πορείαν ἑλικοειδεῖς ἔχει τὰς ὁρμὰς ἐφ' ὃ βούλεται τάχος. (47) καὶ πολυχρονιώτατον δέ ἐστιν, οὐ μόνον τε ἐκδυόμενον τὸ γῆρας νεάζειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὔξησιν ἐπιδέχεσθαι μείζονα πέφυκε· καὶ ἐπειδὰν τὸ ὡρισμένον μέτρον πληρώσηι, εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναλίσκεται, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ὁμοίως αὐτὸς ὁ Τάαυτος κατέταξε γραφαῖς. διὸ καὶ ἐν ἱεροῖς τοῦτο τὸ ζῶιον καὶ μυστηρίοις συμπαρείληπται. (48) εἴρηται δὲ ἡμῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγραφομένοις Ἐθωθ(ι)ῶν(?) ὑπομνήμασιν (F 8) ἐπὶ πλεῖον, ἐν οἷς κατασκευάζεται, ὅτι ἀθάνατον εἴη, καὶ ὡς εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναλύεται, ὥσπερ πρόκειται· οὐ γὰρ θνήσκει ἰδίωι θανάτωι εἰ μὴ βίαι τινὶ πληγὲν τοῦτο τὸ ζῶιον. Φοίνικες δὲ αὐτὸ Ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα καλοῦσιν. ὁμοίως καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι κνὴφ ἐπονομάζουσι· προστιθέασι δὲ αὐτῶι ἱέρακος κεφαλὴν διὰ τὸ πρακτικὸν τοῦ ἱέρακος. (49) καί φησιν Ἐπήεις(?) ἀλληγορῶν – ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς παρ' αὐτοῖς μέγιστος ἱεροφάντης καὶ ἱερογραμματεύς, ὃν μετέφρασεν Ἄρειος Ἡρακλεοπολίτης – κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· 'τὸ πρῶτον ὂν θειότατον ὄφις ἐστίν, ἱέρακος ἔχων μορφήν, ἄγαν ἐπίχαρις, ὃς εἰ ἀναβλέψειε, φωτὸς τὸ πᾶν ἐπλήρου ἐν τῆι πρωτογόνωι χώραι αὐτοῦ· εἰ δὲ καμμύσειε, σκότος ἐγίνετο, ἔμφασιν διδοὺς ὁ Ἐπήεις, ὅτι καὶ διάπυρόν ἐστι διὰ τοῦ φάναι διηύγασε'· φωτὸς γὰρ ἴδιόν ἐστι τὸ διαυγάσαι. (50) παρὰ Φοινίκων δὲ καὶ Φερεκύδης (Vorsokr.^{6} 7 [71] B 4) λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἐθεολόγησε περὶ τοῦ παρ' αὐτῶι λεγομένου Ὀφιονέως(?) θεοῦ καὶ τῶν Ὀφιονιδῶν, περὶ ὧν αὖθις λέξομεν. (51) ἔτι μὴν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐννοίας τὸν κόσμον γράφοντες περιφερῆ κύκλον ἀεροειδῆ καὶ πυρωπὸν χαράσσουσι καὶ μέσα τεταμένον ὄφιν ἱερακόμορφον (καὶ ἔστι τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα ὡς τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν Θῆτα), τὸν μὲν κύκλον κόσμον μηνύοντες, τὸν δὲ μέσον ὄφιν συνεκτικὸν τούτου Ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα σημαίνοντες. (52) καὶ Ζωροάστρης δὲ ὁ μάγος ἐν τῆι Ἱερᾶι Συναγωγῆι τῶν Περσικῶν φησι κατὰ

---

3 τε BO τὸ A^{ac} τῶι A^{c} (m. 1?) 6-11 ὡς – ἀναλύεται om. B 7 ἐν μυστ. v (vor Mras) 8-9 ἐπιγραφομένοις O -γεγραμμένοις A γεγραμμένοις AH 9 ἐθωθων A ἐθωθῶν O ἐθωθιῶν NDV^{ac} Θωθείων ('Kommentar zu den schriften oder lehren des Thot') Gutschmid, Eissfeldt ἐθῶν θείων Scal Ἐθῶν Ὀθνείων Mras 10 ἀθάνατον A -τος O 13 κνὴτ I 15 (21) ἐπήεις BO ὀπήεις A ὁ om. A 16 παρ' αὐτοῖς: *scil.* τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις? 17 μετέφρασεν ‹εἰς Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν› Gaisford 18 τὸ πρῶτον om. B ὂν A ὃν BO 19 ἐπίχαρες O 21 ὁ ἐπήεις BO ὀπήεις A καὶ om. BO 24 Ὀφιονέως Orig. *c. Cels.* 6, 42(?) ὀφιωνέως B^1 O ὀφίονος A 25 ὀφιονιδῶν A -ωνίδων O -εωνίδων B 27 μέσα A μέσον BO

XUM

λέξιν· 'ὁ δὲ θεός ἐστι κεφαλὴν ἔχων ἱέρακος, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πρῶτος· ἄφθαρτος, ἀίδιος, ἀγένητος, ἀμερής, ἀνομοιότατος(?), ἡνίοχος παντὸς καλοῦ, ἀδωροδόκητος, ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθώτατος, φρονίμων φρονιμώτατος. ἔστι δὲ καὶ πατὴρ εὐνομίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης, αὐτοδίδακτος, φυσικὸς καὶ τέλειος καὶ σοφὸς καὶ ἱεροῦ φυσικοῦ μόνος εὑρετής'. τὰ δ'αὐτὰ καὶ 'Οστάνης φησὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῆι ἐπιγραφομένηι 'Οκτατεύχωι. (53) πάντες δὲ τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Τααύτου λαβόντες ἐφυσιολόγησαν, ὥσπερ πρόκειται. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα στοιχεῖα τὰ διὰ τῶν ὄφεων ναοὺς κατασκευασάμενοι ἐν ἀδύτοις ἀφιέρωσαν, καὶ τούτοις ἑορτὰς καὶ θυσίας ἐπετέλουν καὶ ὄργια, θεοὺς τοὺς μεγίστους νομίζοντες καὶ ἀρχηγοὺς τῶν ὅλων. τοσαῦτα καὶ περὶ τῶν ὄφεων».

(54) ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὰ μὲν τῆς Φοινίκων θεολογίας τοῦτον περιέχει τὸν τρόπον, ἣν ἀμεταστρεπτὶ φεύγειν . . . . ὁ σωτήριος εὐαγγελίζεται λόγος. (55) ὅτι δὲ μὴ μῦθοι ταῦτα καὶ ποιητῶν ἀναπλάσματα λανθάνουσάν τινα ἐν ὑπονοίαις ἔχοντα θεωρίαν τυγχάνει, σοφῶν δὲ καὶ παλαιῶν (ὡς ἂν αὐτοὶ φαῖεν) θεολόγων ἀληθεῖς μαρτυρίαι τὰ καὶ ποιητῶν ἁπάντων καὶ λογογράφων πρεσβύτερα περιέχουσαι, τό τε πιστὸν τῶν λόγων ἐπαγόμεναι ἀπὸ τῆς εἰσέτι δεῦρο ἐν ταῖς κατὰ Φοινίκην πόλεσί τε καὶ κώμαις κρατούσης τῶν θεῶν προσηγορίας τε καὶ ἱστορίας τῶν τε παρ' ἑκάστοις ἐπιτελουμένων μυστηρίων, δῆλον ἂν εἴη ὡς μηκέτι χρῆναι τούτων βιαίους ἀνιχνεύειν φυσιολογίας, σαφῆ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔλεγχον ἐπιφερομένων τῶν πραγμάτων. τοιαύτη μὲν οὖν ἡ Φοινίκων θεολογία.

B

5 (7) LYDUS *De mens.* 4, 154 p. 170, 3 Wü: (οἱ δὲ Φοίνι)κες κατὰ τ(ὸν τῆ)ς ὁμωνυμίας (τρόπον εἴτε κατ)ά τίνα ἀ(λληγορ)ίαν ἄλλως πως περὶ Κρόνου ἔχου(σιν, ὡς ἐκ τῆ)ς δευτέρας τῶν Φοινικικῶν τοῦ 'Ερεννίου Φίλωνος (ἔστι λαβεῖ)ν. καὶ βασιλεῦσαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἡ ἱστορία πα(ρα)δίδωσιν, (ὡς ἔμπρό)σθεν ἀφηγησάμην, κ(ατά) τὲ τὴν Λιβύην (καὶ) Σικελίαν (καὶ τοὺς ἑσπερίους τό)πους, καὶ π(ό)λιν κτίσαι, ὡς ὁ Χάραξ (103 F 32) φησίν, τ(ὴν τότε μὲν λεγ)ομένην

---

2 ἀγεννητος BO 4-5 δικαιοσύνη A 6-10 καὶ ὀστάνης – ἀφιέρωσαν om. B 7 ὀκτατεύχωι A -τέχνω O 8 ἀπὸ τοῦ τααύτου O παρὰ ταυθοῦ A 10 ἀδύτοις A αὐτοῖς GNV (O zerstört) 11 τούς τε B 13-22: Euseb. *P.E.* 2 pr. 1-2 (= Eus²) 14 ἣν ἀμεταστρεπτὶ BO ἧς -τεὶ A 15 τινα BO τὴν A 19 θεῶν BO θείων A 20-22: δῆλον ἂν εἴη ἀπό τε τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν συγγραφέων καὶ δὴ καὶ τῶν νομιζομένων θεολόγων ὁμολογίας, δι' ἧς ἐμαρτύρησαν τοὺς παλαιοὺς καὶ πρώτους τὰ περὶ θεῶν συστησαμένους μηδὲν εἰς φυσικὰς ἀναφέρειν τροπολογίας μηδ' ἀλληγορεῖν τοὺς περὶ θεῶν μύθους, ἐπὶ μόνης δὲ τῆς λέξεως φυλάττειν τὰς ἱστορίας Eus² 22 οὖν om. A 24-p. 817, 3: ( ) edd 28-29 (καὶ – τό)πους Wünsch (οἰκίσαι τε τοὺς τό)πους Hase 29 κτίσαι v κτῆσαι O

XUM

Κρονίαν, νῦν δὲ Ἱερὰν πόλιν, ὡς Ἰσίγονος (περὶ Παλ?)ικῶν θεῶν (IV) καὶ Πολέμων (IV) καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν τῆι Αἴτνηι (F 11 N^{2}) π(αραδιδόασιν, καὶ ὡς πᾶσ)α ἡ ἱστορία κατὰ τὸν Εὐήμερον (63 T 4) ποικίλλ(εται) . . . .

OHNE BUCHZAHL (BUCHTITEL)

6 (8) Steph. Byz. s.v. Νίσιβις· πόλις ἐν τῆι περαίαι τῆι πρὸς τῶι Τίγρητι ποταμῶι. Φίλων ἐν Φοινικικοῖς Νάσιβις φησὶ διὰ τοῦ ᾱ· Οὐράνιος (675 F 30) δὲ διὰ τοῦ ε̄ Νέσιβις. σημαίνει δέ, ὥς φησι Φίλων, νάσιβις τὰς στήλας· ὁ δὲ Οὐράνιος «νέσιβις» φησί, «σημαίνει τῆι Φοινίκων φωνῆι λίθοι συγκείμενοι, συμφορητοί».

7 (–) Lydus *De mens.* 4, 53 p. 109, 13 Wü: ὅτι πολλὴ τοῖς θεολόγοις διαφωνὴ περὶ τοῦ παρ' Ἑβραίων τιμωμένου θεοῦ καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἔστιν . . . . . . ὁ μέντοι Πορφύριος ἐν τῶι Ὑπομνήματι τῶν λογίων τὸν δὶς ἐπέκεινα (τουτέστιν τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν) τὸν παρὰ Ἰουδαίων τιμώμενον εἶναι ἀξιοῖ, ὃν ὁ Χαλδαῖος δεύτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα (τουτέστιν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ) θεολογεῖ. οἱ μέντοι περὶ Ἰάμβλιχον καὶ Συριανὸν καὶ Πρόκλον δημιουργὸν αὐτὸν τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ κόσμου νομίζουσιν εἶναι, καλοῦντες αὐτὸν τῆς τετραστοίχου θεόν. ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαῖος Βάρρων περὶ αὐτοῦ διαλαβών φησ· παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἐν τοῖς μυστικοῖς αὐτὸν λέγεσθαι Ἰάω ἀντὶ τοῦ φῶς νοητὸν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώσσηι, ὥς φησιν Ἐρέννιος. καὶ Σαβαὼθ δὲ πολλαχοῦ λέγεται, οἷον ὁ ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑπτὰ πόλους (τουτέστιν ὁ δημιουργός). πολλαὶ μὲν οὖν οὕτω περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξαι, κρείττους δὲ μᾶλλον οἱ ἄγνωστον αὐτὸν καὶ ἄδηλον θεολογοῦντες. ὅτι δὲ σφάλλονται οἱ Διόνυσον αὐτὸν εἶναι νομίζοντες . . . . ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄν τις τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς νομίμων λάβοι . . . .

[2. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΦΟΙΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ]

(F 4)

3. ΕΘΩΘ(Ι)ΩΝ (?) ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΑ

8 (9) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 10, 48: s. F 4 p. 815, 8 ff.

4. ΠΕΡΙ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ

(cf. F 1 § 21; F 7)

9 (6) Origenes *c. Cels.* 1, 15 p. 67, 21 Koetschau: πόσωι δὲ βελτίων Κέλσου . . . ὁ Πυθαγόρειος Νουμήνιος, ὅστις ἐν τῶι πρώτωι Περὶ τἀγαθοῦ λέγων περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὅσα περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἀσωμάτου διείληφεν, ἐγκατέταξεν αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἰουδαίους . . . . . λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἕρμιππον (IV) ἐν τῶι πρώτωι Περὶ νομοθετῶν ἱστορηκέναι Πυθαγόραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγεῖν. καὶ Ἑκαταίου δὲ

---

1 (περὶ Παλ)ικῶν M. Mayer (περὶ Ἑλλην)ικῶν Hase 2 καὶ ὡς Wünsch ἢ ὡς v 6 νάσιβες R 7 νέσιβες R 8 νάσιβες R ὁ δὲ P ὡς δὲ RV νέσιβες R 16-19 οἱ χαλδαῖοι τὸν θεὸν ἰαὼ λέγουσιν ἀντὶ – δημιουργός X ὅτι Ηαω (so!) παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἑρμηνεύεται φῶς νοητὸν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώσσηι Kedren. p. 296, 19 Bonn. 18 ὥς φησιν Ἐρέννιος om. X 24: s. zu p. 815, 9 30 ἐγκατέταξεν: s. Euseb. *P.E.* 9, 7 31-32 λέγεται – ἀγαγεῖν: Joseph. *c. Ap.* 1, 161 ff. (737 F 1)

XUM

τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ φέρεται Περὶ Ἰουδαίων βιβλίον (264 T 7c), ἐν ὧι προστίθεται μᾶλλόν πως ὡς σοφῶι τῶι ἔθνει ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὡς καὶ Ἑρέννιον Φίλωνα ἐν τῶι Περὶ Ἰουδαίων συγγράμματι πρῶτον μὲν ἀμφιβάλλειν, εἰ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ ἐστι τὸ σύγγραμμα, δεύτερον δὲ λέγειν ὅτι εἴπερ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ, εἰκὸς αὐτὸν συνηρπάσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις πιθανότητος, καὶ συγκατατεθεῖσθαι αὐτῶν τῶι λόγωι.

10 (5) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 10, 42: (F 2) ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἐν τῶι Περὶ Ἰουδαίων συγγράμματι ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ Κρόνου γράφει·

(43) «Τάαυτος, ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι προσαγορεύουσι Θωύθ, σοφίαι διενεγκὼν παρὰ τοῖς Φοίνιξι, πρῶτος τὰ κατὰ τὴν θεοσέβειαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν χυδαίων ἀπειρίας εἰς ἐπιστημονικὴν ἐμπειρίαν διέταξεν, ὧι μετὰ γενεὰς πλείους(?) θεὸς Σουρμουβηλὸς Θουρώ τε ἡ μετονομασθεῖσα Χούσαρθις(?) ἀκολουθήσαντες κεκρυμμένην τοῦ Taαύτου καὶ ἀλληγορίαις ἐπεσκιασμένην τὴν θεολογίαν ἐφώτισαν».

(44) καὶ μετὰ βραχέα φησίν· «ἔθος ἦν – κατέθυσεν» (= F 3b). (Es folgt F 4).

***11** (–) Helladios *Chrestomath.* (Phot. *Bibl.* p. 529 b 27): ὅτι φλυαρεῖ καὶ οὗτος τὸν Μωσῆν Ἄλφα καλεῖσθαι, διότι ἀλφοῖς τὸ σῶμα κατάστικτος ἦν, καὶ καλεῖ τοῦ ψεύδους τὸν Φίλωνα μάρτυρα.

5. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΣ ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΥ

(T 1)

6. ΠΑΡΑΔΟΞΟΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ Α̅ – Γ̅

12 (1) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 9, 28: s. F 1 § 28.

13 (10) Suda s.v. Παλαίφατος Ἀβυδηνός· ἱστορικός (44 T 3) .... γέγονε δὲ ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος· παιδικὰ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ φιλοσόφου, ὡς Φίλων ἐν τῶι ε̅ι̅ στοιχείωι τοῦ Περὶ παραδόξου ἱστορίας βιβλίου ᾱ καὶ Θεόδωρος ὁ Ἰλιεὺς ἐν δευτέρωι Τρωικῶν (48 F 1).

7. ΠΕΡΙ ΧΡΗΣΤΟΜΑΘΙΑΣ

14 (p. 560) Et. Gen. (Et. M. p. 227, 52; Et. Gud. p. 306, 16 Stef) s.v. γέρανος· ὁ ὄμβρος ὑπὸ Κυρηναίων παρὰ τὸ τὴν γῆν ῥαίνειν· οὕτως Ἑρέννιος Φίλων ἐν τῶι Περὶ χρηστομαθίας· φησὶ δὲ τὴν δευτέραν δασύνεσθαι.

---

6 αὐτῶν Bohéreau αὐτῶι o 7-8 ὁ δ' – γράφει om. B 8 ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα: s. F 1 § 21? 9-15: cf. F 1 § 24/6 9 τάαυτος BO ταυθός A προσαγ. θ̅ω̅ύ̅θ̅ A θὼθ πρ. BO 11 τῶν om. B 12 ὧι BO ὡς A πλείους A πλείστας B^{2}O πλείστους B^1 13 χούσαρθις BO εὐσαρθις A 25-28 om. AF (V fehlt) 27-28 [ἐν τῶι ε̅ι̅ στοιχείωι] Kuester ἐν τῶι * στοιχείωι τοῦ [περὶ π. ἱ.] ᾱ βιβλίου Bernhardy 27 ει GM ε S v ῡ Eudok; s. Rohde *Kl. Schr.* I p. 365 n. 2 στοιχείωι: στίχωι He, Nauck 28 βιβλίου Eudok βιβλίον GMS

XUM

8. ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΣ ΕΚΑΣΤΗ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΕΝΔΟΞΟΥΣ ΗΝΕΓΚΕΝ Ᾱ-Λ̄ (T1; 4)

15 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀμισός· .... ἐν τῶι Πόντωι ...<τὸ ἐθνικὸν> Ἀμισηνός. λέγεται καὶ Ἀμίσιος, ὡς Φίλων ἐν τῶι Περὶ πόλεων.

16 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀνδανία· πόλις Μεσσήνης ὁμώνυμος τῆι χώραι· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἡ Μεσσήνη Ἀνδανία ἐκαλεῖτο, ἣν οἰκίσαι φασί τινας τῶν μετὰ Κρεσφόντου, καὶ οὕτω καλέσαι διὰ τὸ μὴ ἁνδάνειν αὐτοῖς. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀνδανιεύς, ὡς Φίλων ἐν τῆι Περὶ πόλεων. ἐκ ταύτης Ἀριστομένης ἐγένετο, ἐπιφανέστατος στρατηγός ..... λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἀνδάνιος ὡς Ῥιανός (265 F 46).

17 (18a) Et. Gen. (Et. M. p. 149, 50) s.v. Ἀρσινόη· πόλις ἐν Συρίαι ἐπὶ βουνῶι κειμένη· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ βουνοῦ πηγὰς ἐξερεύγεσθαι πλείονας, καὶ ποταμοὺς γίνεσθαι μεγάλους, ἀφ' ὧν ἡ πόλις ὠνόμασται· ἄρσαι γὰρ τὸ ποτίσαι, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἄρσην ὁ τὴν γυναῖκα ποτίζων ἐν τῆι σπορᾶι. οὕτως Σερῆνος ἐν τῆι Ἐπιτομῆι τῶν Φίλωνος.

18 (18b) Et. Gen. (Et. M. p. 207, 42) s.v. Βουκεραίς· κρήνη ἐν Πλαταιαῖς, ἥτις ὠνομάσθη ὅτι Πόλυβος ἐξ Ἄργους ἐπέκτισεν Πλαταιὰς μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμόν, βοὸς αὐτοῦ ἡγουμένης κατὰ χρησμόν, ὥς ποτε Κάδμου, ἣν ἐκεῖσε κατακλιθεῖσαν τῶι κέρατι πατάξαι τὴν γῆν· καὶ κρήνην ἀναφανῆναι, ἣν ἀπὸ τοῦ κέρατος τῆς βοὸς Βουκεραΐδα καλεῖσθαι. οὕτως Θέων ἐν τῶι ὑπομνήματι τοῦ ᾱ Αἰτίων Καλλιμάχου (F 42 Pf). οὕτω καὶ Σερῆνος ἐν τῆι Ἐπιτομῆι τῶν Φίλωνος Περὶ πόλεων, Πολύιδον λέγων τὸν λαβόντα τὸν χρησμόν.

OHNE BUCHTITEL

19 (12) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀγάθη· πόλις Λιγύων ἢ Κελτῶν· Σκύμνος (206 ff.) δὲ Φωκαέων αὐτήν φησιν ἐν τῆι Εὐρώπηι ..... ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη πόλις, ὡς Φίλων, Λ<ιγ>υστίων ἐπὶ λίμνης Λ<ιγ>υστίας· τάχα δὲ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι τῆι πρώτηι, ὡς Εὔδοξος (V)· βαρύνεται δέ. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀγαθῖνος ....

20 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀζανία· μέρος τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ..... καὶ ἔχει ἡ Ἀζανία πόλεις ιζ̄, ἃς ἔλαχεν Ἀζήν. ἔστι καὶ Μασσαλίας(?) ἄλλη, ὡς Φίλων.

3-4 <τὸ ἐθν.> Berkel   4 ἀμηνός R^1 ἀμισίσιος V   5 μεσήνης o   6 οἰκίσαι PR^c -ῖσαι V -ῆσαι R^{ac} 7 αὐτοῖς P αὐτούς RV   19 ὥς B καὶ A   τῶι κέρατι Et. M. τῆς κέρατος AB   21 τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι (ὑπομνήσεως DM) Et. M.   Αἰτίων Syl αἰτίου o   21-23 οὕτω – χρησμόν om. B   25 Λιγύων ἢ v λιγυώνη RVP   27 Λιγυστίων Xyl λυστίων o Λιγυστίνων Holste   ἐπὶ Schubart ἀπὸ o   Λιγυστίας Xyl λυστίας o   28 Εὔδοξος Xyl εὐδόξιος o   βαρύνεται τὸ (om. δὲ) V   30 μασαλίας P Αἰθιοπίας Berkel Ἀζανία Ἀραβίας o. Λιβύης o.ä. (Peripl. M. Er. 15 ff.; Ptolem. 1, 17, 5)?

XUM

21 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀθῆναι· πόλεις κατὰ μὲν Ὧρον ε̄, κατὰ δὲ Φίλωνα ς̄.

22 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Αἴγειρα· πόλις Ἀχαίας ...... Φίλων δέ φησι Κιλικίας πόλιν εἶναι Αἴγειραν.

23 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἁλικαρνασσός· πόλις Καρίας ...... ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Ἴσθμὸς καὶ Ζεφύριον, ὡς Φίλων, καὶ Ζεφυρία.

***24** (–) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀλόπη· πόλις Θεσσαλίας, ἀπὸ Ἀλόπης τῆς Κερκυόνος, ὡς Φερεκύδης (3 F 147), ἢ τῆς Ἄκτορος, ὡς Φίλων· ἔστι δὲ μεταξὺ Λαρίσσης τῆς Κρεμαστῆς καὶ Ἐχίνου. β̄ ἔστι καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀλόπη· γ̄ Ποντου, ἀφ' ἧς Πενθεσίλεια· δ̄ περὶ Εὔβοιαν· ε̄ περὶ Δελφούς· ς̄ περὶ Λοκρίδα.

25 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἄνθεια· πόλις Πελοποννήσου πλησίον Ἄργους, ὡς Φίλων. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀνθεύς. ἔστιν Ἄνθεια καὶ τοῦ Πόντου πόλις πρὸς τῆι Θράικηι ... ἧς μέμνηνται πολλοὶ καὶ Φιλέας (V). ἔστι καὶ κώμη Λιβύης. ἔστι καὶ Ἰταλίας Ῥώμης πλησίον, ἥτις καὶ Ἄντιον μετωνομάσθη, ὡς εἰρήσεται.

26 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἄντισσα· πόλις Λέσβου ἐφεξῆς τῶι Σιγρίωι, ἀφ' ἧς Τέρπανδρος ὁ Ἀντισσαῖος, διασημότατος κιθαρωιδός· ἀπὸ Ἀντίσσης τῆς Μάκαρος θυγατρὸς ἐν τοῖς Φίλωνος. ἔστι καὶ νῆσος μία τῶν Κυκλάδων· καὶ γ̄ Ἰνδικῆς, ἣν ἀναγράφει Φίλων καὶ Δημοδάμας ὁ Μιλήσιος (428 F 3).

27 (15) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἄργουρα· πόλις Θεσσαλίας ἡ πρότερον Ἄργισσα. ἔστι καὶ τόπος τῆς Εὐβοίας Ἄργουρα, ὅπου δοκεῖ τὸν Πανόπτην Ἑρμῆς πεφονευκέναι. τὸ ἐθνικὸν ἔδει Ἀργουραῖος, ὡς καὶ Φίλων· Ἀπολλόδωρος (244 F 154) δέ φησιν ... Ἀργείους ὀνομάζεσθαι ....

28 (13) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀρτέμιτα· νῆσος Τυρρηνικὴ παρὰ τὴν <Αἰ>θάλειαν νῆσον, ὡς Φίλων.

29 (18) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀσπίς· πόλις Λιβύης, ὡς Φίλων.

30 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βαβυλών· Περσικὴ πόλις, μητρόπολις, Σελεύκεια καλουμένη. κτίσμα Βαβυλῶνος, ἀνδρὸς σοφωτάτου, παιδὸς Βήλου, φοιν.? παλαίτατον, οὐχ ὡς Ἡρόδοτος (1, 184?) ὑπὸ Σεμιράμιδος· ταύτης γὰρ ἦν ἀρχαιοτέρα ἔτεσι $\overline{\underline{αβ}}$, ὡς Ἑρέννιος. ἔστι καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτωι πόλις.

---

3 φίλην V 4 <καὶ> Κιλικίας? Mei πόλις P εἶναι R εἶπεν VP ἄλγειραν P 6 ζεφύριον RV ζεφύρια P ζεφυρία RP -ρίων V 8 Φίλων Mei φιλωνίδης o 9 ἔστι τῆς R Ἀττικῆς: Hesych. s.v. Ἀλόπη ἐν Ἄργει καὶ κρήνη ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, ἥτις Φιλότης ἐκαλεῖτο 10 πενθεσίλεια P πενθεσίλεια RV 12 ἄνθα V 14 φιλήας V 20 καὶ γ̄ RP $\overline{ςγ}$ V 23 ἀργούρουρα P 24 ἑρμῆν V δὲ ἔδει R 26 ἀρτέμιτα V ἀρτέμήτα (so) R ἀρτεμίτα(?) P 29-30 Σελεύκεια v σελευκ' R σελευκία VP 30 Βήλου (Pal?) Salm μήδου o Eust. Dion. Per. 1005 31 ὡς om. V 32 $\overline{\underline{αβ}}$ o χιλίοις ὀκτακοσίοις Eust Ἑρέννιος v ἑρρένιος RP ἑρένιος V

XUM

31 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βόσπορος· πόλις Πόντου κατὰ τὸν Κιμμέριον Φοιν.? κόλπον, ὡς Φίλων, καὶ πορθμὸς ὁμώνυμος ἀπὸ Ἰοῦς <τῆς Ἰνάχου> καλούμενος, <καθὼς> Αἰσχύλος ἐν Προμηθεῖ δεσμώτηι (732/4) <γράφει>.

32 (15) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βουθόη· πόλις Ἰλλυρίδος, ὡς Φίλων, Φοιν.? διὰ τὸ Κάδμον ἐπὶ ζεύγους βοῶν ὀχούμενον ταχέως ἀνύσαι τὴν ἐς Ἰλλυριοὺς ὁδόν· οἱ δὲ τὸν Κάδμον ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγυπτίας Βουτοῦς ὀνομάσαι αὐτήν, καὶ παραφθαρεῖσαν καλεῖσθαι Βουθόην.

33 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βοῦρα· πόλις Ἀχαίας· θηλυκῶς· ἀπὸ Βούρας θυγατρὸς Ἴωνος τοῦ Ξούθου καὶ Ἑλίκης. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Βουραῖος· Λυκόφρων (*Al.* 591) <<Δύμη τε Βουραίοισιν ἡγεμὼν στόλου>>. ἐκ ταύτης ἦν Πυθέας ζωγράφος, οὗ ἐστιν ἔργον ὁ ἐν Περγάμωι ἐλέφας, ἀπὸ τοιχογραφίας ὤν, ὡς Φίλων.

34 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Γέρασα· πόλις τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας τῆς δεκαπόλεως. ἐξ αὐτῆς Ἀρίστων ῥήτωρ ἀστεῖός ἐστιν, ὡς Φίλων, καὶ Κήρυκος σοφιστὴς καὶ Πλάτων νομικὸς ῥήτωρ, πᾶσαν παίδευσιν ὡς μίαν ἀποστοματίζων καὶ ἐν συνηγορίαις καὶ παρεδρευταῖς καὶ θρόνοις τὴν ὀρθότητα τῶν νόμων ἐπιτηδεύων.

35 (15) STEPH. BYZ. (plen.) s.v. Δυρράχιον· πόλις Ἰλλυρική, Ἐπίδαμνος κληθεῖσα ἀπὸ Ἐπιδάμνου. τούτου θυγάτηρ Μέλισσα, ἧς καὶ Ποσειδῶνος Δυρράχιος· ἀφ' ἧς ἐστιν ἐν Ἐπιδάμνωι τόπος Μελισσώνιος, ἔνθα Ποσειδῶν αὐτῆι συνῆλθεν, <ὡς Φίλων. Στράβων δ'ἐν ζ (5, 8) φησί>· <<μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ῥιζονικὸν <κόλπον> Λίσσος ἐστὶ πόλις καὶ Ἀκρόλισσος καὶ Ἐπίδαμνος, Κερκυραίων κτίσμα, ἡ νῦν Δυρράχιον ὁμωνύμως τῆι χερρονήσωι [πρότερον] λεγομένη, ἐφ' ἧς ἵδρυται, [ὡς Φίλων]. F 53.

36 (13) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἔγεστα· πόλις Σικελίας, ἔνθα θερμὰ ὕδατα, ὡς Φίλων. ἀπὸ Ἐγέστου τοῦ Τρωός.

37 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἐλαία (SCHOL. EUST. DION. PER. 910)· Φοιν.? .....ἔστι καὶ πόλις Φοινίκης Ἐλαία μεταξὺ Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, ὡς Φίλων.....

---

2 ὡς Φίλων om. Const. Porph. *De them.* 2, 12 2-3 < > aus Const 3 δεσμώτηι P δεσπότηι RV om. Const 4 βουθόην P Ἰλλυρίδος Xyl -ιάδος o 6 βουτοὺς RP om. V 8-9 θηλυκῶς – Ἑλίκης om. P 9 ξούθου R ξάνθου V 10 Δύμης Lyk ἡγεμὴν RV στόλου: στρατοῦ Lyk 13-14 δεκαπόλεως (Plin. *N.H.* 5, 74; 77) Salm τεσσαρεσκαιδεκαπόλεως o 14 ἀστεῖος ὡς P 16-17 παρεδρίαις Berkel 18-19 καὶ Ἐπίδαμνος Const. Porph. *De them.* 2, 9 19 ὑπὸ Ἐπιδάμνου τοῦ ἀρχαίου ἥρωος Const 19-20 ποσειδῶνος S τὸ ποσ. RVP τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος Xyl 20 δυρράχιος S(P?) ὁ δυρράχιος Const δυρραχίς(?) RV(cp.) 21-24 <ὡς Φίλων. Στράβων δ'ἐν η̄ (so!) φησί> – [ὡς Φίλων] Mei 22 <κόλπον> Strab 23 [πρότερον] (om. Strab) v 24 ὡς Στράβων? Mue 26 αἰγέστου τοῦ τρῶος RV 28 φοινίκη Schol Ἐλαία o Schol Ἐλαίς Dion. Per. 910, Eust (οὕτω λέγεται διὰ τὸ ἐλαιοφόρος εἶναι)

XUM

38 (17) Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ιόπη· πόλις Φοινίκης πλησίον 'Ιαμνίας, ὡς Φίλων· ὡς δὲ Διονύσιος (*Per.* 910) Παλαιστίνης· Φοινίκη γὰρ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη. ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ 'Ιόπης τῆς Αἰόλου θυγατρός, τῆς γυναικὸς Κηφέως τοῦ κτίσαντος καὶ βασιλεύσαντος – τοῦ καταστερισθέντος, οὗ ἐστι γυνὴ Κασσιέπεια· οἱ Ἕλληνες κακῶς φασιν –, ἀφ' οὗ Κηφῆνες οἱ Αἰθίοπες. ἔστι καὶ Θεσσαλίας ἄλλη. Φοιν.?

39 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Κῦνος· ἐπίνειον 'Οποῦντος, ὡς Φίλων καὶ Παυσανίας (10, 1, 2)· 'Εκαταῖος (1 F 131) δὲ πόλιν αὐτήν φησιν.

40 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Λάμπη· πόλις Κρήτης ..... καὶ γ̄ τῆς 'Αργολίδος, ὡς Φίλων.

41 (17) Steph. Byz. s.v. Λαοδίκεια· πόλις τῆς Συρίας, ἡ πρότερον Λευκὴ ἀκτὴ λεγομένη καὶ πρὸ τούτου 'Ράμιθα· κεραυνωθεὶς γάρ τις(?) ἐν αὐτῆι ποιμὴν ἔλεγε 'ῥαμάνθας', τουτέστιν ἀφ' ὕψους ὁ θεός· ῥάμαν γὰρ τὸ ὕψος, ἄθας δὲ ὁ θεός. οὕτως Φίλων. Φοιν.?

42 (17) Steph. Byz. s.v. Μαρσύα· πόλις Φοινίκης, ὡς 'Αλέξανδρος (273 F 128) καὶ Φίλων, ἀπὸ † Μαρσοῦ. Φοιν.?

43 (11) Steph. Byz. s.v. Μεγάλη πόλις· .....ἔστι καὶ 'Ιβηρίας Μεγάλη πόλις, ὡς Φίλων.

44 (–) Steph. Byz. s.v. Μεθύδριον· πόλις 'Αρκαδίας ....ἔστι καὶ ἑτέρα πόλις Θεσσαλίας, ὡς Φίλων.

45 (15) Steph. Byz. s.v. Μελίταια· πόλις Θεσσαλίας· 'Αλέξανδρος 'Ασίαι (V)· Θεόπομπος (115 F 373) δὲ Μελίτειαν αὐτήν φησιν. ὁ πολίτης Μελιταιεύς. Ἔφορος λ̄ (70 F 95)· 'οἱ δὲ τύραννοι τῶν Φερῶν καὶ Μελιταιεῖς φίλοι πρότερον ὑπάρχοντες'.

Μελίτεια· Φίλων οὕτω γράφει, τὰ αὐτὰ πράγματα τῆι εἰρημένηι προσάπτων. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Μελιτεύς(?). Φοιν.?

Μελίτη· νῆσος μεταξὺ 'Ηπείρου καὶ 'Ιταλίας, ὅθεν τὰ κυνίδια Μελιταῖά

1-6: s. Komm. 1-2 'Ιαμνίας: aus Ph. auch s.v. 'Ιάμνια· πολίχνιον Φοινίκης – Στράβων (16, 2, 28) δὲ κώμην φησίν – ἀπὸ 'Ιάμνου ἢ ὅτι ἰάμνους ἐκάλουν τοὺς καθύγρους καὶ τεθηλότας τόπους? 3 ἀπὸ τῆς 'Ιοῦς ἢ ἀπὸ 'Ιόπης Eust. Dion. Per. 910 11 Λαοδίκεια πόλις om. V τῆς om. R 12 ῥάμιθαι V ῥάμαθα Eust. Dion. Per. 915 12-13 γὰρ τούτις R (ι in ras.) γάρ πού τις? Mei (korrupter) eigenname? 13 ἐν αὐτῆι om. P(V?) ποιμὴν VP Eust om. R ἔλεγε: ἀνεβόα Eust ῥαμανάθας Salm 14 ῥάμαν (lac. ind.) om. V γὰρ παρ' ἐγχωρίοις Eust ἄθας RVP ἀθὰν Eust ἄνθας Bochart 15 μαρσία R 16 μαρσοῦ RV μάρσου P Μαρσύου Berkel; s. Honigmann *RE* XIV col. 1986, 6 ff. 17 ἰβιρίας P 19 ἔστι δὲ καὶ P 20 Θεσσαλίας om. P(?) φίλων ο Φιλόξενος Ald 21-p. 823, 2: drei artikel (o); verwirrt 21 Μελίταια Mei μελιτταία ο Μελιταία Berkel 22 'Ασίαι: Εὐρώπηι? Mei 23 μελιταεῖς PR^c(?) μελιτταεῖς V 25-26 Μελίτεια – Μελιτεύς gehören zu 27-823, 1 (hinter Καρχηδονίων); mit 21-24 verbanden Berkel, Mei, Mue 27 'Ιταλίας. <ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη πλησίον Σικελίας>, ὅθεν Holste

XUM

φασιν. ὁ οἰκήτωρ Μελιταῖος. ἔστι καὶ πόλις ἄποικος Καρχηδονίων· καὶ δῆμος Οἰνηΐδος φυλῆς. ὁ δημότης Μελιτεύς.

46 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Μυοῦς· πόλις Ἰωνίας, ὡς Φίλων καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν ᾱ Χρονικῶν (244 F 1).

47 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ὀλβία· πόλις Λιγυστική . . . . β̄ πόλις ἐν Πόντωι· γ̄ Βιθυνίας ἀπὸ Ὀλβίας νύμφης· δ̄ Παμφυλίας, ὡς Φίλων – οὐκ ἔστι δὲ Παμφυλίας ἀλλὰ τῆς τῶν Σολύμων γῆς καὶ οὐδὲ Ὀλβία ἀλλὰ Ὄλβα καλεῖται, καὶ οἱ πολῖται Ὀλβαῖοι καὶ Ὄλβιος καὶ Ὀλβία –· ε̄ Ἰβηρίας· ς̄ Σαρδοῦς· ζ Ἰλλυρίδος· η̄ Ἑλλησπόντου· θ̄ Κιλικίας.

48 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Τελμησσός· πόλις Καρίας· ὡς δὲ Φίλων καὶ Στράβων (14, 3, 4) Λυκίας. ἔστι γὰρ ἀμφοτέρων ὅριον μετὰ Δαίδαλα.

49 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Τίος· πόλις Παφλαγονίας τοῦ Πόντου· ἀπὸ Τίου ἱερέως τὸ γένος Μιλησίου, ὡς Φίλων. Δημοσθένης δὲ ἐν Βιθυνιακοῖς (699 F 9) φησι κτίστην τῆς πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἑλόντα Παφλαγονίαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία Τίον προσαγορεῦσαι.

50 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Φαραί· πόλις Μεσσήνης, ὅθεν ἦσαν οἱ Ἀφαρητιάδαι . . . . . εἰσὶ καὶ Φαραὶ Βοιωτίας . . . ἔστι δ' ἄλλη Κρήτης, ἄποικος τῆς ἐν Μεσσήνηι, ὡς Φίλων.

51 (–) Suda s.v. Φιλιστίων· Προυσαεὺς ἤ, ὡς Φίλων, Σαρδιανός· κωμικός.

9. ΠΕΡΙ ΚΤΗΣΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΛΟΓΗΣ ΒΙΒΛΙΩΝ Α̅-Ι̅Β̅.

(T 1; F 54? 55?)

θ̄ (ΙΑΤΡΟΙ)

52 (19) **a**) Steph. Byz. s.v. Κύρτος· πόλις Αἰγύπτου ἐν τῶι μεσογείωι. ἐκ ταύτης Διονύσιος ἦν διάσημος ἰατρός, ἀπὸ τῆς πατρίδος, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος Κυρτὸς ὀνομαζόμενος, οὗ μέμνηται Ἑρέννιος Φίλων ἐν τῶι Περὶ ἰατρῶν. ὁ τόνος τοῦ μὲν ἐθνικοῦ ὀξύς, ὁμόφωνος τῶι πάθει, τοῦ δὲ κυρίου τῆς πόλεως βαρύς, ὡς τὸ κόντος (?) καὶ πόντος. **b**) Schol. Oreibasios III p. 132 Raeder: οἱ περὶ Διονύσιον τὸν Κυρτόν] ὁ Φίλων ἐν τῶι θ̄ Περὶ βιβλιοθήκης κτήσεως καὶ Ἕρμιππος (IV) ἐν τῶι ε̄ Περὶ τῶν διὰ παιδείαν σεμνηθέντων ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ ὁ Σωρανὸς ἐν ταῖς τῶν

---

1 καὶ πόλις del. R¹ ἔστι ‹καὶ ἄλλη νῆσος› καὶ πόλις Klüwer 6 φίλων o Φιλόξενος Ald 7-8 ἀλλὰ – Ὀλβία om. V 10 Τελμησσός v -μισσός o 10-11 καὶ Στράβων Xyl, v ἢ Στ. o 11 ἀμφοτέρων Xyl ἀμφότερα o (?) 13 (18) $\overset{λ}{φι}$ P 16 (18) μεσήνης o 16-17 Ἀφαρητιάδαι Xyl ἀφαριτιάδαι P φαριτιᾶδαι R φαρητιάδαι V 26 ἐρέννιος R ἐρρέννιος V^{c} ἐρρένιος P 27 ἰατρικῶν P ἐθνικοῦ Salm ἐνικοῦ o(?) 28 πόντος καὶ κόντος P κόστος? Mei 30 κτήσεως o κτίσεως Schol Ἕρμιππος v ἕρμηπος Hs 31 παιδίαν Hs ἐνδόξων v εὐδόξων Hs [ἰατρῶν]?

XUM

'Ιατρῶν Διαδοχαῖς φασιν, ὅτι καὶ ὀξυτόνως εἴρηται κυρτὸς ὡς φοξὸς διὰ σωματικὴν ἀσθένειαν, βαρυτόνως δὲ ὡς ἵππος, πύργος, ἐπεὶ ἐκ μεσογαίου πόλεως τῆς Αἰγύπτου λεγομένης Κύρτου ὑπῆρχεν· ἢ ὥς φασί τινες, διὰ τὸ ἁλίσκεσθαι τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας <ὑπ'> αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ τοὺς ἰχθῦς ὑπὸ τῶν ἁλιευτικῶν κύρτων.

53 (20) Steph. Byz. (plen.) s.v. Δυρράχιον· . . . . . ὅμως δὲ νῦν Δυρραχηνοὶ λέγονται· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Βάλαγρος ἐν Μακεδονικοῖς (773 F 2) φησι . . . . καὶ 'Ερέννιος Φίλων ἐν τοῖς 'Ιατροῖς Δυρραχηνὸν ἀναγράφει Φιλωνίδην οὕτως· <<'Ασκληπιάδης ἀκουστὰς ἔσχε Τῖτον Αὐφίδιον Σικελὸν καὶ Φιλωνίδην Δυρραχηνὸν καὶ Νίκωνα 'Ακραγαντῖνον>>. καὶ πάλιν· <<Φιλωνίδης δὲ ὁ Δυρραχηνὸς ἤκουσε μὲν 'Ασκληπιάδου, ἰατρεύσας δὲ ἐν τῆι πατρίδι ἐνδόξως συνετάξατο βιβλία $\overline{\text{με}}$>>.

10. VERSCHIEDENES

54 (–) Suda s.v. Φίλων Βύβλιος: s. T 1 p. 802, 21.

55 (p. 560 **) Lydus *De magistr.* 1, 12 p. 17, 6 Wü: ἐν γὰρ ταῖς Εἰκόσι Τερέντιος ὁ ἐπίκλην Βάρρων – τὸ δὲ Βάρρωνος ἐπώνυμον τὸν ἀνδρεῖον κατὰ τὴν Κελτῶν φωνήν, κατὰ δὲ Φοίνικας τὸν 'Ιουδαῖον σημαίνει, ὡς 'Ερέννιός φησιν – . . . .

56 (15a) Eustath. Dion. Per. 752: ὅτι Φροῦροι Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος βαρυτόνως πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ φρουροί, ὅπερ ὀξυνόμενον δηλοῖ τοὺς φύλακας· τινὲς δὲ Φρῦνοι γράφουσιν ὁμωνύμως τῶι ζώιωι· φρῦνοι γάρ, καθὰ καὶ ὁ Φίλων γράφει, οἱ βάτραχοι.

57 (–) Eustath. Hom. *Il.* Λ 430 p. 855, 4: αἶνος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρουσιν, καθὸ ὁ μὲν αἶνος λόγος ἐστὶ μυθικὸς ἐκφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζώιων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν, ὥς φησι Λούκιλλος ὁ Ταρραῖος (IV) ἐν πρώτωι Παροιμιῶν· ἀπὸ μὲν ἀλόγων, ὡς παρὰ 'Αρχιλόχωι (F 89 D) . . . καὶ 'Ησίοδος (*Opp.* 202) . . . · ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν ὡς παρὰ Καλλιμάχωι (F 194, 6 Pf) . . . . καὶ ἔστιν ὁ αἶνος ἐξηπλωμένη παροιμία. καὶ οὕτω μὲν καὶ τοῦτο κατεστρωμένον οὕτω ῥητῶς ἐν τοῖς 'Ερεννίου Φίλωνος.

791. ZENON VON SIDON

s. III 1^{a}

T

1 (III 174) Suda s.v. Ζήνων Μουσαίου· Σιδώνιος· φιλόσοφος Στωικός.

---

4 <ὑπ'> Daremberg(?) 8 ἐρέννιος S^{e}VP ἐρρ- R(?) ἰατροῖς SRVP 'Ιατρικοῖς v 12 ἐνδόξως S^{e} εὐδόξως RVP 17-19: *De magistr.* 1, 23 p. 27, 1 Wü (ohne Autornamen) 18 'Ερέννιος Fuss ερέννιοι (sol) O 24-29 (παροιμία): Ammon. *De diff. voc.* p. 9 ff.

XUM

CHAPTER THREE

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

i

Translation of Texts Discussed

(802:15) Philo of Byblos. A scholar. He was born in the times close to those of Nero and he lived a long life. (802:17) He himself says that the Severus who was called Erennius was consul[1] when he [Philo] was seventy-eight years old, in the 220th Olympiad. (802:19) A work in twelve books, *Concerning the Acquisition and Selection of Books*, was written by him, [and one in] thirty books, *Concerning Cities and the Illustrious Men Each of Them Produced*. [He also wrote] *Concerning the Reign of Hadrian* (during whose time Philo flourished), and other books.[2]

---

[1] On the rendering of χρηματίζω see Bickerman, "Christians," pp. 111-112.

[2] Jacoby, perhaps following Westermann, *BGM*, p. 380, omits part of this notice retained by all other editors. The passage concludes the entry on Philo and reads as follows: ὅτι ὕπατος γέγονε ὁ Φίλων Ἑρέννιος χρηματίσας ὡς αὐτός φησι: "that Philo, who called himself Erennius, was consul as he himself says." These lines are garbled at best and Kuster was tempted to remove the words ὕπατος γέγονε as an interpolation from the mention of the consul Erennius Severus above. The passage would then simply state that Philo called himself Herennius (see n. 7). Kuster, *Suidae Lexicon*, Vol. 3, p. 613. Jacoby does not explain why he omitted these lines from both the body and critical apparatus of his text, nor does Westermann. Perhaps they took Kuster's position a step further and considered the entire passage an interpolation or better a misplaced comment on 802:17. At the very least, Kuster is correct and it is likely that so are Jacoby and Westermann, if I have divined their true positions.

XUM

(802:22) Hermippos of Beirut. He came from an inland village. He was a disciple of Philo of Byblos, who introduced him to Erennius Severus during Hadrian's reign. (802:23) Although he was the child of a slave he was exceedingly learned and wrote much. He also wrote *Concerning Dreams*.

(802:25) Paul of Tyre. An orator. He flourished at the time of Philo of Byblos. Having been sent as an ambassador to the Emperor Hadrian, he secured the status of Metropolis for the city of Tyre.[3]

(802:26) Herodian of Alexandria. A scholar. The son of Apollonius . . . surnamed Dyskolos. (803:1) He flourished during the reign of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus and thus was younger than Dionysius (the one who wrote the *History of Poetry Sung to Music*), and than Philo of Byblos.

(803:3) *The Phoenician History*,[4] which Sanchuniathon wrote in the Phoenician language, and Philo of Byblos translated into the Greek language in eight books.

---

[3] This must be an error, as Tyrian coins bear the legend *Mētropoleōs* before, during, and after Hadrian's reign, and there is no noticeable gap in such coins. See for example Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Tyre, #290 (94/5 A.D.); 331 (98/9); 338 (104/5); 339 (107/8); 340 (108/9); 315 (112/3); 294 (115/6); 344 (117/8); 346 (121/2); 296 (130/1); 298 (137/8); 321 (139/40). There is thus either an error as to the emperor to whom Paul went as ambassador, or as to the purpose and results of the embassy. Cf. *HA* Hadrian, 14, 1 and Weber, *Untersuchungen Hadrian*, pp. 232-233.

[4] Eissfeldt has suggested translating *historia* in 803:3 as "knowledge or information (*künde*)," and not as "history." Philo's work, as reflected in Eusebius' citations, he argues, is arranged not historically but topically. I believe that Philo intended his book to be read as history. Furthermore, our only information comes from the fragments and we should not readily depart from the ordinary meaning of *historia*. Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau," p. 90.

XUM

(803:6) Serenos. Also called Athenaios, who took the name Ailios. He was a scholar and wrote a condensation in three books of Philo's work _Concerning Cities and Who Were the Illustrious Men of Each_.

ii

The biographical notice in Suidas' _Lexicon_,[5] 802;15-21, is the primary source of information about Philo. As the entry is difficult and ambiguous, it was the subject of much debate in the past century. Rohde discussed it as part of his article contending that _gegone_ and _einai_ in the _Lexicon_ are synonyms of _akmazo_ and are to be translated by Latin floruit.[6] Rohde analyzes our passage as follows. Philo was supposedly seventy-eight in the year when Herennius Severus was consul, Ol. 220 or 101-104 A.D.[7] This, Rohde argues, is unlikely as Philo was still alive in 117 A.D., thirteen to sixteen years later, and wrote about Hadrian's reign. Philo, according to Rohde, was seventy-eight during Herennius' consulship but this could not have been as early as 01. 220 if Philo was to survive to Hadrian's days. Rohde inferred from 802:22-24 that Herennius was actually consul during Hadrian's reign. He therefore assumed that the consulship and Philo's seventy-eighth year were in 01. 227 3/4 or 132 A.D. Philo would have been born in 54 A.D. and his acme would have been around 94 A.D. Suidas, according to Rohde, specifies this acme twice: once at the beginning of the entry as "close to the times of Nero," γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τῶν ἐγγὺς Νέρωνος, and once at the end as at the time of Hadrian (ἐφ' ὅυ καὶ ἦν ὁ Φίλων). Philo's acme is specified in this imprecise, and seemingly contradictory manner because, according to Rohde, Suidas' image of the entire era is based on the circle of Greek scholars of Nero's day, and not on Domitian's reign. The acme could also be placed at the time of Hadrian because Suidas has compressed the time between Nero and Hadrian.

---

[5] The correct usage is, of course, "the Suda," as the title of the work and not Suidas, as the supposed author's name. I have nevertheless chosen to retain the common usage in the hope of simplifying identification and reference.

[6] Rohde, _KS_, Vol. 1, pp. 130-132. Rohde rejects the previously accepted opinion of Schöne, "Untersuchungen Sappho," p. 744 that _gegone_ refers to birth.

[7] Philo chose this odd synchronism because of his association with Herennius Severus. Philo's full name was Herennius Philo (817:18 and 818:12) and Philo may have been a slave or client of Herennius Severus. When he was either freed or obtained citizenship, Philo would have followed the common practice and taken the latter's name. It is equally possible that one of Philo's ancestors took the name from an ancestor of Philo's Herennius.

Rohde's interpretation is not satisfactory. The note on Hermippos (802:22-24) need not imply that Herennius was consul during Hadrian's reign. The text simply states that Philo introduced Hermippos to Herennius during Hadrian's reign. There is also little difficulty in believing that Philo was seventy-eight in 101/4 and survived to write a work on Hadrian's reign. If Philo was seventy-eight in 101/4, he would have been between ninety-one and ninety-four in 117. Suidas himself states that Philo lived a long life. Furthermore, if both *gegone*, at the beginning of the entry, and *ēn*, at the end, indicate Philo's acme, why was it necessary to note this fact twice? Why should Philo's acme be mentioned at the end of the notice when it had already been given, in its usual position, at the beginning? Finally, Rohde's difficult hypothesis of "compression of time" is not relevant in our case, even if one accepts it. Rohde argues that Suidas compressed the time between Nero and Trajan: "Wer sich nicht zu Trajan stellen lassen wird der muss sich gefallen lassen zu Nero gestellt zu werden; whoever would not be placed in Trajan's time must resign himself to being placed at Nero's time."[8] Rohde thus explains the fact that virtually no person in the Lexicon is placed in the reigns between Nero and Trajan. However, if Philo's acme did fall in Domitian's reign, and if two reference points for the acme were to be given, following Rohde they should have been Nero and Trajan, not Nero and Hadrian.

The difficulties in Rohde's interpretation are compounded by his insistence that gegone in 802:15 must be understood as indicating the acme. If our passage is one of the few in the Lexicon where gegone indicates birth,[9] another interpretation of the entry, that of Niese becomes attractive. Niese found a consul suffectus T. Hoenius Severus in 141/2 A.D. (01. 230) and since no consul--whether ordinarius or suffectus--with the name of Herennius Severus is otherwise known in the Imperial period,[10] Niese proposes that Hoenius Severus was actually Herennius and that Philo was seventy-eight in 141/2 A.D. Philo would have been born in 64 A.D. as the gegone clause states, once gegone is understood as indicating birth.[11]

---

[8] Rohde, KS, Vol. 1, pp. 129-130.

[9] In spite of Rohde, gegone can mean "was born." See Jacoby, Apollodors Chronik, p. 49.

[10] The most precise date which Smallwood (in 1966) in her Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, p. 12, can suggest is "Hadrianic."

[11] Niese, Stephani Byzantii, p. 28.

XUM

Niese's solution is also open to objections. First, the year 64 A.D. is within Nero's reign (54-68), while Suidas' circumlocution, "in those times close to those of Nero," suggests a date outside Nero's reign. Secondly, if Philo was born in 64, his acme should fall in 104 A.D. This does not agree with the final statement in the entry--that Philo flourished at the time of Hadrian. These two objections, however, are far from fatal to Niese's solution, since the dates need not be taken that strictly. However Rohde has shown that Niese's emendation of Hoenius to Herennius is unjustified, since the reading Hoenius is confirmed by several inscriptions.[12]

The facts given in Suidas' entry on Philo thus can be made to support two sets of dates for Philo's life, but neither set is wholly consistent with the data in the entry and both rest on misapprehensions. When Herennius was consul cannot be confirmed and the meaning of gegone is unclear. We are left with two clear statements: (1) that Philo was seventy-eight in 01.220 (101-104 A.D.), and (2) that he survived to write a work on the reign of Hadrian (117-138). Of these statements the first, since it involves a numeral could easily be corrupt. That it is corrupt is suggested, but not proved, by Suidas' statements concerning Herodian of Alexandria in 803:1-2. To say that Herodian, who flourished at the time of Marcus Antoninus, was younger than Philo would be meaningless unless Philo flourished sometime near Marcus' reign (161-180). If this inference is correct, Westermann's emendation of εἰς μακρόν (802:16) to εἰς Μάρκον would be quite attractive.[13] But all this is inference, and not proof.

---

[12] Rohde, KS, Vol. 1, p. 131, n. 1.

[13] Westermann, BGM, p. 380.

One possible difficulty with this system of dates is posed by a letter of Pliny (4,28). We learn there that a certain T. Herennius Severus, "a most learned _vir_," wanted portraits of C. Nepos and T. Catius for his library. If this is Philo's Herennius Severus it is tempting to believe that Philo, the author of _Concerning the Acquisition and Selection of Books_, a work intended as a guide in the choice of works for a library,[14] aided Herennius in organizing and/or maintaining his library. But there is a chronological difficulty if Philo was not seventy-eight in 101-4 but only sometime during the reign of Hadrian or Antoninus Pius, as argued above. Pliny's letter dates from 104/5,[15] and Herennius Severus is already a _vir_, a mature man. On the chronology proposed above, Philo would be rather young in 104/5, perhaps around thirty years old. The authority would then be younger than his employer, which is odd. One would normally expect the opposite. This objection is not fatal to the dates for Philo proposed. Perhaps Philo was precocious, or as is more likely, perhaps Philo was the friend of some other Herennius Severus, a generation younger than Pliny's contemporary. In any case, Pliny's letter is a reminder of the inconclusiveness of any chronological conclusion based on the entries in Suidas. Until we have definite outside proof it is best to say that Philo lived sometime in the second half of the first century A.D. and survived, at least until the reign of Hadrian.[16]

---

[14] On Philo's guide to book-collectors see Birt, _Antike Buchwesen_, p. 362.

[15] See Sherwin-White, _Letters_, p. 34.

[16] In translating the entry from Suidas, I have adopted the chronology based on birth ca. 70 A.D. and survival to ca. 160 A.D. For a similar conclusion see Gudeman "Herennius," col. 651 and Clemen, p. 1.

While there is debate concerning when Philo lived, we have no information concerning where he lived. Byblos and Rome are two obvious possibilities.

XUM

iii

Eusebius of Caesarea (260-340 A.D.), the church historian, is responsible for the preservation, in his Praeparatio Evangelica, of the most significant quotations from Philo's Phoenician History. Eusebius' purposes in that work and his reliability therefore deserve careful attention.

Eusebius states that his purpose in the Praeparatio Evangelica is to show the nature of Christianity and to explain why the Christians have left the ancestral gods and adopted a position that is neither Greek nor Hebrew (4d-5a). By surveying the pagan religions, Eusebius hopes to show that the Christians acted correctly in deserting them (16d). Eusebius will demonstrate the error of paganism by quoting the works of believers in paganism. Thus, he will be free from the suspicion of having invented his arguments (17a).

Eusebius divides pagan theology into the mythical, physical and philosophical. He considers the Phoenicians and Egyptians the originators of mythical theology (17b), and Philo is quoted within this context as the major source on Phoenician theology.[17]

We need not fear that Eusebius's words have been poorly preserved. The manuscript tradition is extensive and ancient. MS. A, written in 914, contains the first five books. MS. H was copied from A in the thirteenth century and is valuable for filling lacunae in A. MS. B, which represents a different tradition is from the second half of the twelfth century. There are numerous other MSS. and, as Henry observes: "Aucun éditeur d'Eusèbe ne s'est jamais plaint du mauvaise état de la tradition

---

[17] Eissfeldt, RS, pp. 91-2 realized this.

manuscrite de la P.E.; No editor of Eusebius has ever complained of the bad condition of the manuscript tradition of the *P.E.*"[18]

Since Eusebius' work is avowedly polemical, and since Eusebius claims that he is proving his own contentions by using the writings of his opponents, his reliability and the accuracy of his quotations must be carefully evaluated. This accuracy and reliability have been challenged, most of all by J. Scaliger who noted Eusebius' "*errata, absurditates, deliria, et halluciationes*--errors, absurdities, delusions and hallucinations."[19]

Freudenthal, in the nineteenth century, defended Eusebius' reliability quite fully.[20] More recently a most remarkable proof has been suggested by Henry.[21] Eusebius quotes Plato, *Theatetus* 173c6-174a2 twice: once directly in *P.E.* 12,29,602c and once quoting Clement (*Strom*. 5,14,98), who quoted Plato in *P.E.* 13,13,672d6. This Platonic passage was also quoted by Iamblichus (*Protrep*. 14) and by Theodoretus (*Gr. Aff. Cur*. 12,24-5). A comparison of these citations shows that Eusebius, in the direct quotation, and Iamblichus quote the passage in its entirety, while others omit words and phrases. One example will suffice. In the opening sentence Socrates says to his interlocutor Theodore: λέγωμεν δὴ ὡς ἔοικεν σοί γε δοκεῖ περὶ τῶν κορυφαίων ; "Then, if that is your wish, let us speak concerning the leaders." Eusebius' direct citation is the only one not to omit *hōs* through *dokei*, which recalls the preceding, but not quoted, context of the passage. Furthermore, in Book 13 where Eusebius cites Clement's quotation of Plato, Eusebius agrees with the direct tradition of Clement's works and not with that of Plato. Thus when Eusebius quotes Plato, he is faithful to Plato; when he quotes Clement, he does not "improve" the text by additions from the direct tradition of Plato, but quotes Clement faithfully.

---

[18] Henry, *Eusèbe et Plotin*, p. 54.

[19] *Ap*. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, p. 3, n. *

[20] *Ibid*., pp. 3-16.

[21] Henry, *Eusèbe et Plotin*, pp. 64-66.

Nor is this surprising. An accurate appreciation of the manner in which a large work, compiled from writings of other authors, would be composed, explains this reliability. The tedious work in libraries was done by assistants. Thus Cicero asked Atticus for extra slaves to help him catalogue his library. (*Ad. Att.* IV, 4b). Origen's commentaries on the Bible would not have been written had his patron Ambrose not supplied funds for a large staff of secretaries.[22]

In spite of the fact that Eusebius accurately preserved the words of his sources and did not invent sources, one must remember that he may have distorted and perverted the original intention of the author he quotes by judicious or injudicious editing or through misleading introductory or concluding remarks (whether intentionally or by misunderstanding). However, the author's own words, which we may assume Eusebius has carefully preserved with substantial accuracy, sometimes suffice to prevent our being misled. (See further below pp. 70-72 and 118-119.

---

[22] Cf. Beare, "Books and Publication," p. 161.

iv

Since almost all we know of Philo's Phoenician History comes from Eusebius, it seems useful, before beginning the more detailed discussion of the fragments, to consider briefly the general character and structure of the material. Eusebius' discussion of Philo can be divided into eight sections:

1. Porphyry on Sanchuniathon (803:19-804:11).
2. Excerpts from the introduction or preface of Philo's Phoenician History in which Philo discusses Sanchuniathon (804:12-806:9; 807:10-19).
3. The Cosmogony (806:11-807:7).
4. The discovery of the essentials of civilization (807:19-809:14).
5. The Life of Kronos (809:14-811:24).
6. Division of the World and Philo's conclusion (811:24-813:22).
7. Child sacrifice (813:26-814:17).
8. Snakes (814:18-816:12).[23]

These excerpts from Philo all seem to come from the first book of the Phoenician History and have thus been assigned by Jacoby. We should note, however, that part of the section on child sacrifice is cited twice by Eusebius, once as coming from Philo's Peri Ioudaiōn (P.E. 1,10,42) and once as coming from the first book of the Phoenician History (P.E. 4,16,11=814:3-17). In addition, Eusebius says that the section on snakes comes from Sanchuniathon's work On the Phoenician Elements which supposedly was also translated by Philo (814:18-19).[24]

Philo, as we shall see, is an ardent Euhemerist, and all his gods were either mortals deified for their contribution to humanity, or forces of nature. It is on account of the Euhemerism that one can speak of his gods as having nationality. Many of the gods have both Phoenician and Greek names, such as Kronos=El (809:22) or Chousor=Hephaistos (808:22-23). Others are identified by Greek or Phoenician name only, such as Apollo (811:7), Athena (810:5), Atlas (809:23), or Baitylos (809:23).

---

[23] Cf. a similar list in Williams, pp. 4-6.

[24] The relationship between the Peri Ioudaiōn and the Phoenician History will be discussed in detail below, Chapter Ten, pp. 289-290. The work on the Phoenician Elements will be treated in the same chapter, pp. 293-294.

Eusebius has excerpted Philo, and the fact that we are dealing with excerpts is probably responsible for many of the difficulties of interpretation we will encounter. There are rarely more than two sentences devoted to any character and the subjects change rapidly. The transitions seem abrupt and unclear, the flow of the narrative far from smooth. This leaves the impression that much has been skipped between the sections Eusebius cites. It is therefore often difficult and dangerous to argue from context or silence.

There are, however, important differences in the literary character and outlook of the various selections. The cosmogony is written in poetic parallelism, the same technique in which Ugaritic and Biblical poetry were written, while the other sections show no trace of this technique. The account of the discovery of the essentials of civilization is thoroughly Euhemeristic, with Philo taking pains to remind his reader that the characters involved were mortal humans who did not become gods until they were divinised by posterity after their death. The life of Kronos, on the other hand, begins with a mortal--*tis Elioun* (808:14)--but once mentions *theos Ouranos* (810:28). In the section on the division of the world, the characters are almost constantly identified as *gods*: *Basileus theōn* (811:25), *Theos Taautos* (812:15), *synontōn theōn* (812:16), *tois de loipois theois* (812:24),

XUM

Theōi Taautōi (812:29), and *Theos Taautos* (813:3).[25] Hence we must seriously consider the possibility that Philo compiled his account from several sources of quite different origin and date.

---

[25] These conclusions concerning the differences between the various sections are, of course, discussed more fully in the relevant chapters.

XUM

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER THREE

An attempt at a complete consideration of Philo's Phoenician History cannot overlook Wagenfeld's famous work.[26] Wagenfeld claimed to have discovered a full manuscript of Philo's book. The most complete analysis and critique of Wagenfeld was written by Muller,[27] who, among other objections, noted that Wagenfeld's text agrees exactly with Eusebius' quotations so far as they went, save that when Eusebius states that he has omitted material, Wagenfeld supplies the omissions. Furthermore, Wagenfeld's text contains readings which are obvious typographical errors found in Orelli's edition of the Philonic fragments.

---

[26] Wagenfeld, Sanchuniathon.

[27] Muller, "Wagenfeld," pp. 507-517.

CHAPTER FOUR

PORPHYRY'S ACCOUNT OF SANCHUNIATHON

i

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Eusebius)

(803:19) Sanchuniathon narrates these things. He was a most ancient man and, as they say, lived before the time of the Trojan War. He is declared to have been approved because of the accuracy and veracity of his Phoenician History. (803:22) Philo (of Byblos, not the Hebrew) published Sanchuniathon's entire work, translating it from the Phoenician language into Greek.

(803:24) In our own times, the author of the intrigue against us mentions these things in the fourth book of his study directed against us, testifying thus, word for word, about the man.[1]

(Porphyry)

(803:26) Sanchuniathon of Beirut gives the truest account concerning the Jews, since it agrees best with their places and their names. (803:28) For he took the treatises written by Hierombalos, the priest of the god Ieuo, who dedicated his work to Abibalos, the king of Beirut. (804:2) [Hierombalos' work was] accepted as correct by Abibalos and by those who investigated the truth in his time. (804:3) The times of these people fall before that of the Trojan War and, roughly speaking, approach those of Moses, as the succession of Phoenician kings reveals. (804:6) Moreover, Sanchuniathon (who, with a love of truth, collected and wrote up in the Phoenician language, the complete ancient history from the records in each city and from the texts in the temples), lived around the time of Semiramis, Queen of the Assyrians, who was recorded to have lived either before the Trojan War or at that very time. (804:11) Philo of Byblos translated Sanchuniathon's work into the Greek language.

---

[1] Cf. Williams, p. 69.

ii

803:19 Sanchuniathon

There is no longer any doubt that the name which Eusebius wrote as Σαγχουνιάθων[2] or Σαγχωνιάθων[3] is a transliteration of the well-known Phoenician name סכניתן . This name has been found in an inscription of the third century B.C. at Hadrumetus,[4] and in the variant form שכניתן.[5] The pattern of transliteration of Hebrew names in the Septuagint confirms Eusebius' transliteration.[6] By analogy with other

---

[2] *P.E.* 1,9,19, and following.

[3] *P.E.* 10,9,11-16 = Jacoby's Eus^2 of the critical apparatus to l. 28. Theodoretus, *Gr. Aff. Cur*. 2,44 also wrote Σαγχωνιάθων, but Theodoretus is not independent and is evidence only of what he read in Eusebius. See below, p. 51.

[4] *NE* 432b2.

[5] See Chabot, "Punica," p. 6.

[6] אכיש of I Kings 2:39 becomes Αγχους in Greek, the Hebrew כ rendered by Greek γχ. This transliteration may indicate that the γχ

Phoenician names such as עבדיתן,[7] and בעליתן,[8] Sanchuniathon must mean the god _Skn_ gave,[9] and must be a personal name.[10]

There are two alternatives for the vocalization of the divine name _Skn_, *_sakun_ and *_sakon_. These two vocalizations are definitely attested by two Latin inscriptions which mention a Secchun[11] and a Sachonis.[12] Eusebius' two transliterations may reflect these alternate Phoenician vocalizations but more probably are mere paleographic variants, ου and ω being readily confused.[13] Athenaeus, _Deipn_: 3,126, has the corrupt reading Σουνιάθων, but is nonetheless evidence for the ου vocalization.[14] If the Phoenician god _Skn_ has anything to do with the Mesopotamian divinity Šakan, also known at Ugarit (discussed below),

---

in Sanchuniathon need not stand for a double _k_ in the original. Cf. Milik, "Cultes," p. 558. The Hebrew ת is usually transliterated by θ in the Septuagint: e.g. נביות of Gen. 28:9 becomes Ναβαιώθ.

[7] CIS I, 112a.

[8] CIS I, 118.

[9] ιαθων is a perfect of the *_qatōl_ form. See Harris, _Grammar_, par. 13, p. 41.

[10] Cf. the older interpretations of Orelli, pp. x-xi, and Movers, p. 99. Movers in particular so doubted Sanchuniathon's humanity that he tried to interpret his name as the title of a book. The correct interpretation of the name was first proposed by Nöldeke, "Inscriptions," p. 1829.

[11] CIL VIII, 5099.

[12] CIL VIII, 698.

[13] The difference between the two passages of Eusebius might go back to two different secretaries or MSS. used by Eusebius, but since Eusebius is quoting the same passage of Porphyry in both places, it seems more probable that his secretaries used the same MS. in both. That either Eusebius or his secretaries should have reflected differences of Phoenician pronunciation is unlikely.

[14] The passage from Athenaeus is discussed in further detail below, p. 51.

the **sakon* vocalization would be preferable. **Sakon* would represent the usual shift á)ó which is a common characteristic of the Canaanite dialects.[15] The identification, however, is possible at best and the choice between vocalizations must be left open.

The earliest Phoenician inscription to mention *Skn* is CIS I, 112a of 591 B.C.[16] in which the god's name is compounded in the personal name עבדסכן. *Skn* was also honored with an altar dedicated by *Bnḫdš* son of *Bʿlytn*, a dedication commemorated by CIS I, 118 (=KAI 58).[17] *Skn* is also mentioned in a Punic inscription, CIS I, 4841 which was erected by *Ytnbʿl* who was an עבד בת סכן בעל אקדש.[18] Texidor has recently argued convincingly for restoring the god's name in KAI 258 and reading *ʾdr skn*.[19] Finally, Milik has suggested interpreting סכות בנות of II Kings 17:30 as *sk(n)t Bnt*, the attendant of the creator goddess Banit, now known from the Hermopolis papyri.[20] Milik's suggestion, it should be noted, is based on his understanding of *Skn*'s functions, a problem to which we must now turn.

None of the Phoenician inscriptions mentioned give any hint of *Skn*'s functions. The accepted attempts to understand the deity's role have therefore been based on the etymology of his name. The root skn is found in at least two Phoenician inscriptions, that of Ahiram (KAI 1, line 2) and CIS I, 5 (=KAI 31) from Limassol in Cyprus.[21] The Ahiram inscription speaks of מלך במלכם וסכן בס[כ]נם while KAI 31 mentions someone who was סכן קרתחדשת. Skn in both cases must mean a viceroy or governor of a territory.[22] It is etymologically and linguistically the same as the sūkinu of EA 256,9 which glosses rābiṣu, as the סכן in Isaiah 22:15, and perhaps as the skn in the Ugaritic text 146:2. On analogy with the god Paqid-Qos, the administrator of the Edomite national god Qos, Milik and others have explained the function of the god Skn as the "superintendant god."[23] The name Skn would thus be understood, like the Ugaritic Kṯr wḫss as a proper name which should be translated.[24] If Skn was identified with Greek Hermes it would greatly strengthen this interpretation of his function, but the identification is open to some doubt as will be discussed below.

---

[15] Harris, *Development*, pp. 43ff.

[16] The most recent discussion of the date of this inscription is in Peckham, *Development*, p. 127, n. 63.

[17] The inscription is dedicated to אסכן אדר. For a discussion of this title see *KAI ad loc*.

[18] Milik, "Cultes," p. 558, tentatively translates this phrase as *Sachun maître-des Saintes*.

[19] Teixidor,BES 1971 (in press).

[20] Milik, "Cultes," pp. 557-558. Cf. Driver, "Geographical Problems," p. 18*.

There is one serious objection to understanding Skn as the "superintendant god" which has not yet been raised by scholars. The root skn is known from an Amarna gloss for rābiṣu, as was mentioned above, and it is vocalized sūkinu. This vocalization clearly reflects the shift from ā in an earlier stratum of the language to ō (= ū in cunieform). In the earlier stratum the word must have been *sākinu.[25]

---

[21] For dates see KAI ad loc.

[22] See Harris, Grammar, s.v. p. 126. See also Held, "Azitawadda."

[23] Milik, "Cultes," p. 558, based on a suggestion of Cooke, Textbook, p. 100.

[24] See Gaster, Thespis, p. 14.

[25] See Harris, Development, pp. 43-44.

In Hebrew and Phoenician the stressed long _a_ becomes long _o_. Thus *sákinu should become _sókin(u)_, which is in fact behind the vocalization of Hebrew סֹכֵן. If the function of the god _Skn_ is explained by his derivation from the root _skn_, his name should also be vocalized _sōkin_. But the vocalizations which are attested are *_sakun_ or *_sakon_ and these cannot be derived from _sōkin_. Therefore the name cannot be derived from the root _skn_. This philological argument is particularly damaging to the interpretation of _Skn_ as the superintendant god since that interpretation is based on etymology alone.

Another possible explanation of the god's functions, hitherto unmentioned, therefore deserves consideration. There is a secondary god, of fertility and cattle, known from Mesopotamian texts by the name of Sumuqan.[26] CT 29:46,10 tells us that his name was pronounced _Ša-ka-an=Šakkan_, and he is probably intended in an Akkadian word list from Ugarit where a ^{d}šakan$_{2}$ is mentioned.[27] If this god is at all connected with the Phoenician _Skn_ two difficulties must be overcome: the shift from Akkadian _š_ to Hebrew-Phoenician _s_, and the double _k_ in the Akkadian name. The shift can be attested:[28] Akkadian _Karšu_, meaning belly,[29] is the semantic and etymological equivalent of Biblical כרש' (Jer. 51:34), of כרס in Mishnaic Hebrew (e.g. Rosh Hashanah 2:8), and of כרסא in Aramaic. The double _k_ is more difficult.[30] In favor of the identification, however, is the fact that CT 24:42,91 calls *Sumuqan-Šakkan ša sūtî*, a Sutean god, or an Amorite god according to Tallqvist.[31] If *Sumuqan-Šakkan* is really a West Semitic deity it would be possible to see the Phoenician *Skn* as the native version of a god who penetrated into Mesopotamia with his worshipers. Furthermore, *Šakkan* can be connected with the **sakon* vocalization of the name of the Phoenician god discussed above. This suggestion of *Skn*'s functions is possible at best. Perhaps it would be prudent to concede that we really do not know *Skn*'s functions.

---

[26] Tallqvist, _Götterepitheta_, p. 450. See e.g. the text published by Thoreau-Dangin, "Iaḫdunlim," p. 52, col. III, lines 16-19.

[27] _Ugaritica V_, p. 216, line 101.

[28] See Moscati, _Comp. Grammar_, 8.32, pp. 34-35.

[29] See Von Soden, _AHw_, pp. 450f.

Cooke, following Schröder,[32] has suggested that *Skn* was the "Phoenician counterpart to the Greek Hermes."[33] The arguments for this conclusion are not equally convincing. Schröder cites the epithet of Hermes (*Iliad* 20,72) Σωκος, which he understands as a transliteration of *Skn*, but this epithet is perhaps best understood as derived from the Greek verb σωκέω, the derivation adopted by LSJ. Schröder's other argument is somewhat stronger. CIS I,118 is the inscription on the altar, dedicated to *Skn* mentioned above. Two other altars were found near this altar, dedicated to Hermes and Zeus Soter. These three altars, if connected, might be read as if a bilingual inscription.

Even the evidence from the altars, however, is weak. What is one to do with Zeus Soter, and how is he related to *Skn* and Hermes?

---

[30] For Milik, of course, who believes that *Skn*'s name was pronounced with a double *k* (see above, n. 6)this would pose no problem.

[31] See Tallqvist, *Götterepitheta*, p. 451.

[32] Schröder, *Sprache*, pp. 196-8, n. 9.

[33] Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 100.

More damaging to the position of Schröder and Cooke is the fact that the three altars are connected only by the fact that they were erected near each other. They were not offered by the same man, nor do they share any other characteristics. Hirschfeld, the original publisher of these inscriptions, writes that the place they were found must have been one at which sailors and travelers of many nations fulfilled their obligations in accord with the prescriptions of their native religions.[34] What these "obligations" were, and why a particular god was thanked must have varied from case to case.[35] These inscriptions therefore hardly prove that Skn was the counterpart of Hermes.

The positive arguments marshalled by Cooke and Schröder are therefore rather weak. In addition there is one strong argument against their position. Philo's identifications of the Greek equivalents of Phoenician gods seem uniformly correct; whenever there are bilingual inscriptions referring to these gods, the same Greek equivalents appear.[36] Yet Philo identifies Hermes with Thoth=Taautos and not with Skn (804:28-29). The identification of Skn and Hermes, to conclude, should be used with caution, if at all.[37]

---

[34] Hirschfeld, "Attischen Kunstlerinschriften," p. 21.

[35] It is not even necessary to assume that Skn was thanked by a sailor or traveler for events which occurred on the voyage, although this assumption is quite natural. If Skn was thanked for some beneficence while traveling the interpretation of his function as god of fertility and cattle (very tentatively proposed above) might be less plausible.

[36] See Chapter Five, note 16.

[37] To my knowledge, the only scholar to doubt the equation of Skn and Hermes is Eissfeldt, T. und S., pp. 50-51, n. 2. Eissfeldt does not explain why he doubts the identification.

Returning to Sanchuniathon, the authority on Jewish History praised by Porphyry, we possess some information about him in addition to Eusebius' citations from Porphyry and Philo. Sanchuniathon is never mentioned before Philo of Byblos. After Philo he is first mentioned by Athenaeus, the pagan Greek rhetorician who flourished at the end of the second and at the beginning of the third centuries A.D. In Deipnosophistai 3, 126 Kynoulkos says to Oulpianos of Tyre:

> ἐμπίλασο, Οὐλπιανε, χθωροδλάψου πατρίου ὃς παρ' οὐδενι τῶν παλαιῶν μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα γέγραπται πλῆν εἰ μὴ ἄρα παρὰ τοῖς τὰ φοινικικὰ συγγεγραφόσι, Σουνιάθωνι καὶ Μώχῳ τοῖς σοῖς πολίταις.
>
> Stuff yourself Oulpianos with the xthorodlapsou [LSJ s.v. "said to be a Syrian food"] of your fatherland which, by Demeter, has been written about by none of the ancients, except by those who write about Phoenician matters--by Souniathon [sic] and Mochos, your fellow citizens.

Sanchuniathon is a Tyrian according to Athenaeus.[38]

Theodoretus' information about Sanchuniathon, Gr.Aff. Cur. 2,44 ff. seems based entirely on Eusebius (803:24-804:12). Theodoretus knows nothing not found in Eusebius and his quotations from Philo agree almost literally with Eusebius'. Theodoretus is therefore not an independent source.

The next mention of Sanchuniathon is in Suidas, Lexicon s.v. Sanchuniathon:

> Τύριος φιλόσοφος. ὃς γέγονε κατὰ τὰ Τρωϊκά. Περὶ τῆς Ἑρμοῦ φυσιολογίας, ἥτις μετεφράσθη, Πάτρια Τυρίων τῇ φοινίκων διαλέκτῳ, Αἰγυπτιακὴν θεολογίαν καὶ ἄλλα τινά.
>
> A Tyrian philosopher. He flourished at the time of the Trojan War. [He wrote] Concerning the Physical Doctrines of Hermes

---

[38] Athenaeus' mention of Sanchuniathon refutes Lobeck's theory that he was invented by Eusebius. See Lobeck, pp. 1265-1279. Lobeck's theory, incidentally, is testimony to the effectiveness of Philo in Eusebius' propaganda.

> (which was translated); The Ancestral Traditions and Customs of the Tyrians, in the Phoenician language; Egyptian Theology, and other works.

Gaisford, in his edition of Suidas, notes the following marginal entry:

> Σαγχουνιάθης, 'Αϊδώνιος (Σιδώνιος?) τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ Σεμίραμιν ἔγραψε τῇ φοινίκων διαλέκτῳ φυσιολογίαν καὶ ἄλλα τινά.
>
> Sanchuniathon, Aidonian (Sidonian?), during the time of Semiramis, wrote in the Phoenician language a work on physics and other works.[39]

The main entry may perhaps be partially dependent on Athenaeus or based on the same tradition as Athenaeus' remarks. It makes Sanchuniathon a Tyrian and the author of a book on Tyrian history, the book which may have prompted Kynoulkos' remarks at the end of the citation from Athenaeus. But this is very slight evidence. The other books attributed to Sanchuniathon in the main entry are not known, although The Physical Doctrines of Hermes, which was translated, may refer to Philo (See 804:24-29).

The sources of the marginal entry cannot be precisely determined. Two of the three pieces of information it contains support the conclusion that its sources are the material preserved by Eusebius. In agreement with the quotation from Porphyry, (804:11), Sanchuniathon is made a contemporary of Semiramis. The authorship of a work on physics in the Phoenician language is ascribed to Sanchuniathon. This could easily be a description of the material which Philo claimed to be

---

[39] Gaisford, Suidae Lexicon, Vol. 2, p. 3241. Cf. Williams, pp. 131-132. If the marginal entry established that Sanchuniathon was definitely considered a Sidonian, the confusion of Tyre and Sidon for his city might be a criterion for dating Sanchuniathon. One might then date him to a time when Tyre and Sidon were united, and hence could be confused. Unfortunately, Sidonian is uncertain.

XUM

translating from Sanchuniathon's Phoenician book, which contains a section on physics (see below, Chapter Six). However, the fact that Porphyry considers Sanchuniathon a native of Beirut while the marginal entry makes him Aidonian, (whatever that may mean, perhaps Sidonian) argues that the source of the marginal entry is not Eusebius.

The final mention of Sanchuniathon is in a fifteenth century MS. found in the library of Madrid.

> Σαγχουνιάθων ὁ Βηρύττιος τὴν φοινίκων θεολογίαν ἐξέδωκεν ἣν Ορφεὺς μετήνεγκε εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν καὶ τελετὰς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.
>
> Sanchuniathon of Beirut published the Phoenician History which Orpheus translated into Greek. [He] also [published a work on] the mysteries of the Egyptians.[40] .

More interesting than the agreement of this text with Porphyry on Sanchuniathon's city is the attribution of the translation of the Phoenician History to Orpheus. Perhaps the author of these sentences noticed the parallels between the Orphic cosmogonies and the cosmogony which Philo claimed to be translating from Sanchuniathon (See Chapter Six, p. 158), and believing Philo's repeated claims (e.g. 813:4-22) that the Greeks took their theological and religious notions from the Phoenicians, explained the similarities by assuming that Orpheus translated Sanchuniathon.

These four testimonies concerning Sanchuniathon show a fairly wide variety of works attributed to him in antiquity. He was supposedly a native of two, if not three, Phoenician cities of major importance: Tyre, Beirut and perhaps Sidon. These texts, like Porphyry (804:9-10) make Sanchuniathon a contemporary of the Trojan War. Finally, these texts seem independent of each other and of Porphyry and Philo, suggesting that many traditions about Sanchuniathon were known in antiquity.

---

[40] Iriarte, p. 346.

Modern scholars have proposed dates of their own for Sanchuniathon. The most interesting of these proposals are those of Albright and Eissfeldt. Albright, in an article published in 1938 wrote that "the name Sanchuniathon would have been impossible before the early first millenium."[41] Characteristically, Albright does not state the reasons for his conclusion. Eissfeldt[42] already opposed Albright and noted that Albright was arguing from silence, and ignoring names such as Biblical יהונתן.[43] I should add that we have definite proof that theophoric names were compounded with ytn during the second millenium B.C. Posener has published a Middle Kingdom execration text in which a certain Ytnhddw, prince of Bet Hadar is mentioned.[44] Ytnhddw can mean nothing other than "Hadad gave," and differs from Sanchuniathon only in the name of the god and the position of the verb.

More recently, Albright has suggested that "Sanchuniathon was a refugee from Tyre who settled in Berytus about the second quarter of the sixth century B.C."[45] Again, Albright does not state his evidence and it is not clear why he chose to make Sanchuniathon a Tyrian refugee at Beirut rather than the opposite. Albright's arguments for the sixth century date are based on "style and place in the history

---

[41] Albright, "Recent Progress," p. 24.

[42] Eissfeldt, RS, pp. 70-71, n. 4.

[43] יהונתן is formally different from Sanchuniathon in that it is formed on the root ntn as opposed to ytn.

[44] Posener, Princes et Pays, pp. 66-67.

[45] Albright, YGC, p. 195.

XUM

of thinking."[46] In other words, Albright has dated Sanchuniathon to agree with the date he assigns to the traditions ascribed to Sanchuniathon. If one disagrees with Albright's date of the traditions, as I do (see especially Chapter Six, pp. 128-130), his date needs other support.

While Eissfeldt has not suggested a precise date for Sanchuniathon, he has collected evidence which he believes makes it difficult to date him "later than the seventh century B.C."[47] Eissfeldt builds his arguments on the fact that Porphyry says that Sanchuniathon's Phoenician History was full of the names of those who sacrificed their children in times of great danger, πλήρης... τῶν θυσάντων (813:28-814:1). Curtius Rufus, in describing the siege of Tyre by Alexander the Great mentions that some Tyrians proposed reviving the practice of child sacrifice, a practice which had long been discontinued by the time of Alexander (IV,III,15,23). Eissfeldt accepts Curtius Rufus' testimony and concludes that Sanchuniathon must have lived sometime before 323 B.C., when child sacrifice was still performed, for his book to be full of the names of the sacrificers.[48] Eissfeldt dates the discontinuation of official child sacrifice in Phoenicia to the seventh century B.C., the same time, he thinks as the Book of Deuteronomy ended child sacrifice in Israel (Deut. 18:9f.). Sanchuniathon must therefore have lived before the seventh century B.C.

---

[46] Albright, private communication of March 22, 1971.

[47] Eissfeldt, RS, p. 69.

[48] Ibid., p. 70.

XUM

Eissfeldt's conclusion is open to grave doubt since (in spite of Curtius Rufus) child sacrifice continued in Judea after Deuteronomy (Isa. 57:5) and seems to have continued among the Phoenician colonists in Africa down to Roman times, perhaps even to Philo's day. Tertullian, in a famous passage of the *Apologeticus* (9,2) reports the following:

> *Infantes penes Africam Saturno immolabantur palam usque ad proconsulem Tiberii, qui eosdem sacerdotes in eisdem arboribus templi sui obumbractricibus scelerum votivis crucibus exposuit, teste militia patriae nostrae, quae id ipsum munus illi proconsuli functa est.*
>
> In Africa infants used to be sacrificed to Saturn, and quite openly, down to the proconsulate of Tiberius, who took those same priests and on the trees of his [Saturn's] temple - the same trees that had overshadowed their crimes - set them up, like votive offerings, on crosses; and the soldiers of my own country are witnesses to it, who served that proconsul in that very task.[49]

Thus although Eissfeldt is probably correct that Sanchuniathon lived at a time when child sacrifice was current (unless he was being deliberately archaistic, a supposition not unlikely) yet this time might include the Roman period, until a generation before Tertullian.[50]

In conclusion, Sanchuniathon seems to have been an authority on Phoenician religion and antiquities about whose date, place of origin, and works many different traditions were current. The differences suggest a relatively early date, but this may not be decisive.

---

[49] Translation from LCL. The debate over the identity of Tiberius is not important for our purposes. Whether he was the Emperor (Carcopino, "Enfants," p. 595, n. 3), or some recent proconsul of Africa (Rendall in LCL *ad loc.*) Tertullian testifies to the survival of the practice into Roman times.

[50] Albright, *YGC*, pp. 232-235 also concedes that child sacrifice continued until the second century A.D. Admittedly, it is dubious whether or not the practice continued so long in Phoenicia as in Africa. Colonial areas are often more conservative than the metropolis.

Any precise date must await the analysis of the material Philo claimed to be translating from him.

803:19-20 anēr - presbyteros

In introducing the quotation from Porphyry, Eusebius prepares the reader for the quotation by paraphrasing it. Since Sanchuniathon was a contemporary of Semiramis, and since she lived either before or at the time of the Trojan War (804:9-10), Eusebius states that Sanchuniathon is reputed to have lived before the time of the Trojan War. The date attributed to Sanchuniathon is based on the quotation from Porphyry.[51] The date will therefore be discussed below, in the comments on Porphyry, but it should be remembered that Eusebius wanted his evidence to be as old as possible (see also the Appendix to this chapter).

803:21 apodechthēnai.

Is this the aorist passive infinitive of apodeiknymi, meaning to write or publish, or of apodechomai, meaning to receive or approve? Müller prefers the former,[52] Gifford the latter.[53] I prefer the latter because apodechthēnai is the aorist passive infinitive of apodeiknymi in Ionic only, while it is the regular form for apodechomai.

803:23 ouch ho Hebraios.

Since Philo Judaeus was better known, Eusebius considers it necessary to remind the reader that the Philo he will cite is not the Jewish one.[54]

---

[51] Cf. Williams, pp. 3,26,34,48.

[52] Müller, FHG, Vol. 3, p. 563.

[53] Gifford, Eusebius, Vol. 1, p. 35.

[54] Williams, p. 133, inexplicably makes the two Philo's cousins.

803:23 *metabalōn*

Philo's claim to have translated Sanchuniathon is mentioned several times, e.g., 804:11-12; 804:19-21; 806:11-14; 813:23-24; 813:28-814:3; 814:19-19. This claim is, of course, the basis for one of the main problems in the scholarly discussion of the fragments.[55] The whole tenor of the fragments, it should be noted, is inexplicable unless Philo claimed to be translating. Philo is later to argue that all other treatments of his problem are incorrect because they were based on inaccurate and false sources, while he has the truth because he used the true sources (804:19-806:10). This true and accurate source is Sanchuniathon whose methods and goals Philo describes in detail. All this argument would be meaningless if Philo did not also claim that he was faithfully rendering what could supposedly be read in Sanchuniathon. It may solve some of the problems scholars find in the fragments to see Philo more as adaptor than as translator,[56] but this is not what Philo intended.[57]

803:24 *memnētai - syskeuēn*

The reference is to Porphyry's polemic *Against the Christians*.[58]

803:26 *Ioudaiōn*

Eissfeldt feels that information about the Jews is out of place, since Eusebius has praised the accuracy and reliability of Sanchuniathon's works on the Phoenicians. Furthermore, whether Sanchuniathon or Hierombalos is the subject of 804:1-3, this information comes,

---

[55] See Chapter One, pp. 1-4.

[56] Thus Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 48-50.

[57] See below, Chapter Five, pp. 100-102.

[58] Cf. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 797, n. 1.

XUM

ultimately, from a work dedicated to the king of Beirut and approved by Phoenician scholars. Eissfeldt therefore suggests emending *Ioudaiōn* to *Ieoudaiōn*. The son Kronos sacrificed was called Ieoud and the Phoenicians still use that name for an only child (814:7). According to Eissfeldt, Porphyry states that Sanchuniathon has the truest information concerning the names of the children who were sacrificed and the places where they were sacrificed. Eissfeldt assumes that Porphyry was interested in child sacrifice among the Phoenicians since he was discussing the biblical sacrifice of Isaac and Jephtah's daughter.[59]

In evaluating Eissfeldt's arguments we must distinguish between the difficulty based on Eusebius' praise and the problem of Phoenician approval of information about the Jews. Eissfeldt, I believe, is unnecessarily disturbed by the latter problem, given the history of relations between the Phoenicians and Jews, stretching back to the days of Solomon and Hiram of Tyre. In view of the close geographical, linguistic, and ethnic connections of Jews and Phoenicians, works on the Jews might be approved by Phoenician scholars or Jews might be discussed by an author like Sanchuniathon.[60]

Moreover, whether or not Hierombalos is an Israelite priest who served YHWH (see below), his data was utilized by Sanchuniathon, a Phoenician. Such a source would appeal to Porphyry for use in his polemic as its independence of pro-Jewish or pro-Christian bias would seemingly be guaranteed by Sanchuniathon.

---

[59] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 26-35.

[60] It is possible that Sanchuniathon only mentioned the Jews in passing and did not devote a whole work to them, but Porphyry's expression argues against this conclusion. Cf. Williams, pp. 139-140.

Finally, Porphyry's interest in geography and attested use of geographical data in other fragments of his work would in itself be a sufficient argument for retaining *Ioudaiōn*. In discussing the size of the Sea of Galilee Porphyry quotes οἱ γοῦν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν τόπων ἀφηγούμενοί φασι θάλασσαν μὲν ἐκεῖ μὴ εἶναι, λίμην δὲ μικράν. . . ; "those who narrate the truth about places say that it is not a sea but a small lake."[61]

An appreciation of Eusebius' purposes in quoting Porphyry can remove the problem found in Eusebius' praise. Eusebius quotes Porphyry on Sanchuniathon before presenting Sanchuniathon's interpretation of the Phoenician religion (as presented by Philo) for two reasons. First he can thus free himself of the suspicion of having invented his source and establish its reliability by showing that the great defender of paganism, Porphyry, believed Sanchuniathon trustworthy.[62] In addition, as Movers first noticed, Eusebius can thus embarrass Porphyry with the opinions of the same author whom Porphyry believed reliable.[63] For both these reasons Eusebius is happy to be able to quote Porphyry's approval of Sanchuniathon's works, although the quoted passage would show to an attentive reader that Porphyry had praised Sanchuniathon's accuracy about the Jews, not about the Phoenicians.

804:1 Hierombalos

Although there are other possibilities, such as חרבעל, this name is probably a transliteration of ירבעל as suggested by Albright.[64] This name is not attested in any text or inscription to the best of my knowledge,[65] but names similar to Hierombalos have been found in inscriptions. The name רמבעל is found in CIS I, 99 (from Abydos in the fifth or sixth century B.C.) and בעלרם is the name of a king of Idalion, the father of Milkyathon (CIS I, 90). רמבעל and ירמבעל are identical in meaning. The former is compounded with the *qal qtl* of the verb רום, the latter with the *qal yqtl*. *Qtl* and *yqtl* forms of the verb are often used as equivalents in Biblical and Ugaritic poetry.[66] The name Hierombalos would thus be an exact equivalent of Biblical Jeremiah.

---

[61] Porphyry, *Against the Christians*, frag. 55 (Harnack).

[62] This point was also seen by Williams, p. 137.

[63] Movers, pp. 117-118.

804:1 *Ieuō*.

Orelli thought that Ieuo,[67] must be YHWH the God of Israel,[68] but he was troubled by the name of the priest Hierombalos, compounded with Baal. He therefore suggested that Hierombalos must have been the

---

[64] Albright, *FSAC*, pp. 317-318, n. 57. Eissfeldt's proposed equation of Sourmoubelos (818:12) and Hierombalos seems unnecessary. See Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 19-21.

[65] Bochart believed that Gideon who was also called ירבעל (Jud. 7:1) was Hierombalos. Bochart, p. 770. There are obvious chronological difficulties in placing Hierombalos-Gideon both before the Trojan War and at the time of the Judges, as Orelli, p. 3, n. 3, already saw. Even more serious is the fact that ירבעל (meaning "Baal has substituted," according to Held, Cf. Noth *IPN*, p. 206) and ירמבעל are not equatable. Finally, could Gideon have written *hypomenmata* which have left no trace in Israelite tradition but were known to Sanchuniathon? In spite of these obvious difficulties, Bochart's suggestion was revived by Meyer, *GdA*, Vol. II,2, p. 177, n. 3.

[66] Held, "YQTL-QTL."

[67] Theodoretus normalized *Ieuo* to *Iaō*, the usual transliteration in the LXX for YHWH.

[68] Orelli, p. 4, n. 4.

XUM

priest of some pagan god whose name has fallen out of the text and been replaced by Ieuō=Iaō=YHWH. Eissfeldt, following Orelli, has proposed that the original god must have been Yam--the equivalent of Poseidon and the god of Beirut (813:13), Abibalos' city.[69]

Eissfeldt's suggestion is quite attractive, but it should be noted that the difficulty Orelli sensed is not insoluble. It cannot be escaped by pointing to the enigmatic Yw[70] of the Ugaritic texts,[71] nor will the probable worship of YHWH by other Semitic groups help.[72] If Hierombalos is an authority on the geography of the Jews, he should be a priest of the god of the Jews.

Two other possibilities seem more likely. One is that Hierombalos understood the Baal in his name as simply meaning master, and referring to YHWH. Even more likely is that Hierombalos served YHWH at a time and in a place where YHWH was not worshiped exclusively. Among those devoted to מלכת השמים in Jer. 7:18 and 44:15-19, or in the Jewish community of Elephantine--where two Jews would swear by Ḥ[erembethel] (C7:7) and by Anatyahu (C44) or where money collected for YHW would also be given to Eshembethel and Anatbethel (C22, 120-125)[73]--a priest of YHWH named Hierombalos might be readily found.

---

[69] Eissfeldt, S. von B., pp. 33-35.

[70] Even the reading Yw, it should be noted is uncertain. See Cassuto, Anat, p. 99.

[71] Even if Yw is certain (see note 70), it is not clear that it is a divine name. See Ginsberg, "Anath and Aqhat," p. 21, n. 49.

[72] See Murtonen, Philological Treatise, pp. 43-54. Cf. Clemen, p. 9.

[73] The "Queen of Heaven" in Jeremiah is Ishtar. See Bright, Jeremiah, p. 56. The examples from Elephantine were chosen because even Porten, who systematically attempts to minimize the significance of the evidence for the worship of other gods by the Jews of Elephantine, must admit that these two cases are examples of syncretism. See Porten, Elephantine, pp. 174-175.

XUM

804:1 hos

Who is the subject of this clause, Sanchuniathon or Hierombalos? Whose work was approved by Abibalos and the contemporary scholars? There are two arguments for understanding Sanchuniathon as the subject. First, it might seem that Eusebius understood Sanchuniathon as the subject of the clause since the clause states that its subject's work was approved and Eusebius, in introducing the citation from Porphyry, states that Sanchuniathon's work was approved (803:21). On the other hand, Eissfeldt argues that the hos clause is to be understood in the light of the colophon of UT 62. The colophon mentions the scribe, the chief priest who taught the scribe (lmd), and the king who gave the text to the library. Similarly Sanchuniathon mentions both the priest from whom he learned everything (Hierombalos) and his patron (Abibalos).[74] However, both Driver[75] and Ginsberg[76] translate lmd as dictated, that is, the colophon notes the chief priest who dictated the tablet. Eissfeldt's analogy is thus destroyed.[77]

The argument based on Eusebius' introduction to the quotation is strong. However, Eusebius' statement that Sanchuniathon's work was approved for its accuracy and reliability does not mean that Eusebius understood Sanchuniathon as the subject of the hos clause. Eusebius refers to Sanchuniathon's approval by Porphyry. Furthermore, there is

---

[74] Eissfeldt, S. von B., pp. 26-35. Walcot, Hesiod, p. 18 follows Eissfeldt.

[75] Driver, CML, p. 115.

[76] H.L. Ginsberg in ANET, p. 141.

[77] Destroyed with the analogy are arguments for Sanchuniathon's dates suggested by Eissfeldt on the basis of the analogy.

XUM

strong internal evidence from the hos clause and the sentences that follow that Hierombalos is the subject of the hos clause. When Porphyry, in 803:3-4, specifies the time of toutōn, the people of the hos clause, it is before the Trojan War, as confirmed by the list of Phoenician kings. In 804:9-11, Porphyry specifies Sanchuniathon's time as that of Semiramis, that is either before or during the Trojan War. It is clear that the time of the people of the hos clause is distinguished from that of Sanchuniathon. Accordingly, they must be Hierombalos and Abibalos. For if Sanchuniathon were included in the toutōn of 806:3 and if his time were confirmed by the list of Phoenician kings, there would be no need to introduce a new discussion of his date and a new reference point and proof for that date.[78]

That Hierombalos is the subject of the hos clause is confirmed by Eusebius' comment on our passage in P.E. 10,9,14,485c. Eusebius also placed Abibalos and Hierombalos before Sanchuniathon and Semiramis. This must be the meaning of the text as it stands. The difficulty in perceiving the meaning, however, is a first indication that all is not smooth in Porphyry's account of Sanchuniathon. See below on 804:8.

One final point requires comment. Whomever the dates apply to, they are all around the Trojan War. This is probably no accident and may reflect the concern of barbarian historians of the Hellenistic period to prove their native sources were at least as old if not older than Homer.[79] The dates may therefore argue that the description of Sanchuniathon, Hierombalos, and Abibalos was written during the Hellenistic period.

---

[78] My discussion is independent of a similar one in Nautin, pp. 267-268.

[79] See Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," pp. 70-71

804:1 Abibalos

We should reject the identification of this king with the other known Phoenician kings named Abibalos, the kings of Tyre,[80] Byblos,[81] and Arvad.[82] This Abibalos is king of Beirut.

There should no longer be any doubt that the Greek transliteration Abibalos stands for the Phoenician name אבבעל, now attested in inscriptions and cuneiform transcription.[83] This name is analogous to numerous Biblical names: אבים of I Kings 14:31, אביה of II Chron. 12:16, אבמלך, אביצור, etc.

Albright has attempted to use the names of Hierombalos and Abibalos as further arguments for his date of Sanchuniathon ca. 600 B.C.[84] He argues that such names were popular during the first half of the first millenium B.C. While Albright's statement about the history of names is probably correct, it is not conclusive--names also occur at times when they are not particularly popular--nor does it help much to date Sanchuniathon, who may have been separated by a considerable interval from the authors whose works he used.

---

[80] Josephus _C. Ap_. 113,117.

[81] KAI 5.

[82] Asb. ii, 82. Cf. Williams pp. 34-35 who does not recognize that there were several Phoenician kings named Abibalos.

[83] Jacoby, in the critical apparatus _ad loc_. mentions Nöldeke's emendation to Abedbalos. The emendation is obviously unnecessary, in view of the evidence cited. Inexplicably, it is accepted by Clemen, p. 9.

[84] Albright, _FSAC_, p. 318, n. 57.

804:2 anatheis.

Walcot rendered this word "submitted,"[85] but this is a desperate attempt by Walcot to evade the difficulties for his theory inherent in the usual meaning of anatithēmi in a context such as ours--to dedicate a book. It is highly unlikely that a book written before the Trojan War would contain a dedication. Renan already noted that ancient semitic works were not dedicated by their authors.[86] Among the Greeks the first book to be dedicated was written in the fifth century B.C. and the practice did not become widespread until the Hellenistic period.[87]

The problem could perhaps be avoided if this were a work of Wisdom literature. What Porphyry called "dedication" might then be a misunderstanding of the address by the author to his pupil. But this solution will not work, as Hierombalos and Abibalos are not master and pupil, but priest and king. Moreover, Hierombalos' work is not wisdom literature.

The problem is therefore inescapable. The story that Sanchuniathon's source, Hierombalos, dedicated his book to Abibalos is of Hellenistic origin. This confirms the suspicions noted above that some of Porphyry's information about Sanchuniathon is of Hellenistic origin, and that the description as it stands was written during the Hellenistic period.

---

[85] Walcot, Hesiod, p. 18.

[86] Renan, p. 299. Even today when we know much more about the Ancient Near East than in Renan's time (1858), I know of no Ancient Near Eastern text prior to the Hellenistic period containing a dedication. Clemen, pp. 9-10 confuses the issue. He mentions both the supposed dedication and the approval by the scholars of the time (804:2-3), then gives biblical evidence that texts were submitted to critical scrutiny (II Kings 22:8ff.) and neglects to discuss the problem of dedication.

[87] Denniston, "Dedication," p. 259.

804:7 Philalēthōs

Bochart adopted the reading of Theodoretus, philalēthēs.[88] Bochart considered this word an interpretation of Sanchuniathon's name.[89] However, all the MSS. of Eusebius read philalēthōs, and Sanchuniathon's name has a different and satisfactory explanation.

804:8 hypomnēmatōn - anagraphōn

According to this line Sanchuniathon had two types of sources, the records[90] in each city and the collected temple texts - presumably dedicatory, ritual and historical. Perhaps these temple texts recorded the history, both mythological and actual, of the temple, like the inscriptions of the Greek temple of Lindos where the visits of Kadmos, Minos, Herakles, Menelaus, and Helen are recorded.[91] A parallel to the city records might be the records of Antioch consulted by Malalas for information regarding events in that city during Trajan's Parthian campaigns.[92] These would be the sort of city records most familiar to Philo and Porphyry.

As the text stands, the following sources are attributed to Sanchuniathon in the quotation from Porphyry. Sanchuniathon derived his information about Jews--especially good for Jewish names and geography--from the work of Hierombalos, who lived almost at the time of Moses. The de in 804:6 adds that Sanchuniathon (who lived at the time of Semiramis, that is either before or at the time of the Trojan War), also used the records found in each city and the collected temple texts in composing his history of antiquity as a whole.

---

[88] Bochart, p. 770.

[89] Recently, Bochart has been followed by Charroux, Maître du Monde, p. 39. Charroux has his own obvious reasons for wanting Sanchuniathon to appear reliable.

[90] For the translation anagraphaí=records, see LSJ s.v. II B 4.

[91] Blinkenberg, Tempelchronik, III, IV, V, X, XI.

[92] Malalas, Chronikon, p. 443 (Dindorf).

Something is clearly amiss. The chronological information is not clearly presented, as we have seen, and the description of the sources is confused. The Sanchuniathon of 804:26 wrote about the Jews and based his work on the treatises of Hierombalos. The Sanchuniathon of 804:6, on the other hand (de), wrote about all of antiquity and based his work on the records of cities and the temple texts which he collected and wrote up.

Two explanations of these difficulties are possible. One is that the text of 803:24 is corrupt and that Porphyry was referring to some other author with a different name (another author also named Sanchuniathon would have provoked comment). The name of the author interested in the Jews, who used Hierombalos, has dropped out and, unless one could find traces of a Beirutian scholar who wrote about the Jews before the Trojan War, is irrecoverable. Porphyry, when discussing the sources of his polemic, would have referred to Sanchuniathon and then mentioned this unknown Beirutian as most reliable on the Jews, and then come back to Sanchuniathon as the most reliable for the general history of the area. Either Eusebius or some copyist before him, by confusion, replaced the Beirutian's name with Sanchuniathon's.

This explanation is rather tortuous, which encourages the search for a simpler alternative. We have seen that many works with a wide variety of interests were attributed to Sanchuniathon in antiquity. Tyrian customs and history, physics, Egyptian theology, and the Egyptian mysteries were all supposedly treated by him. Perhaps the contradictions in Porphyry can be better explained by the assumption that Porphyry has combined two or more conflicting traditions about Sanchuniathon. We will be in a better position to identify at least one of these traditions after having analyzed Philo's remarks on Sanchuniathon in the following chapter. For the moment, however, it should be remembered that Porphyry, as a Tyrian, might have known any number of traditions about this famous sage of Phoenician antiquity.

804:9 Semiramis.

Semiramis is introduced incidentally, as synchronistic with Sanchuniathon. She is, of course, the legendary founder of Babylon, according to the stories told by the Greeks. She has now been identified with an actual Assyrian queen, who was regent for her son at the end of the ninth century B.C.[93]

---

[93] Lenschau, "Semiramis," pp. 1204-1212.

XUM

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER FOUR

In the quotation from Porphyry in Eusebius (804:10), it is stated that Semiramis lived either before or during the Trojan War. It is also implied that she lived after Moses, since he lived before the Trojan War. In Jerome's translation of Eusebius' Chronicon, a different date for Semiramis is attributed to Porphyry:

> Ex ethnicis vero ille impius Porphyrius in quarto operis sui libro. . . post Moysen Semiramin fuisse adfirmat. Quae apud Assyrios CL ante Inachum regnavit annis. Itaque iuxta eum DCCC paene et L annis troiano bello Moyses senior invenitur.

> Among the gentiles, forsooth, that impious Porphyry affirms, in the fourth book of his work. . . that Semiramis lived after Moses. She ruled among the Assyrians 150 years before Inachus. Therefore, according to him [Porphyry], Moses is almost 850 years older than the Trojan War.[94]

This method of dating Moses is to make him slightly older than Semiramis whose date was known. She ruled 150 years before Inachus, and it had been previously stated in the Chronicon[95] that Inachus was 700 years before the Trojan War. (One must read 700 with Syncellus' Greek text and not 500 with Jerome's translation or else the arithmetic does not work.) Semiramis is thus dated almost 850 years before the Trojan War, which clearly contradicts Porphyry's statement in 804:10, taken from the same book of the same work, that she lived either before or during the Trojan War.

---

[94] Schöne, Eusebius, p. 4.

[95] Ibid.

This seeming contradiction can be resolved by assuming that the calculation of Moses' date (and the consequent dating of Semiramis) is not part of the quotation from Porphyry, but an addition by Eusebius--an attempt by him to estimate Moses' time, based on *Porphyry's* statement (that Moses preceded Semiramis) and *his own* (Eusebius') date for Semiramis. Thus the direct quotation from Porphyry may end with *adfirmat*. Furthermore, the last sentence speaks about the date according to *Porphyry* (*iuxta eum*). Finally, it can be shown that the total of almost 850 years agrees with the chronology found in the *Chronicon*.

Semiramis herself, according to the *Chronicon*, ruled for 42 years. Azmeis ruled for 38 years; Arius for 30 years; Aralius succeeded Arius and in the fourtieth year of Aralius' reign Inachus began to rule. This is a total of 150 years.[96] Inachus began to rule in year 161 after Abraham's birth;[97] the Trojan War ended in year 835 after Abraham's birth.[98] There is a difference of 674 years. Thus from Semiramis to the Trojan War there is a total of 824 years. Moses, who is slightly older than Semiramis, is thus dated as almost 850 years prior to the Trojan War. Since the attempt to estimate Moses' date and the consequent dating of Semiramis is not based on Porphyry's chronology, but is an attempt by Eusebius to estimate Moses' date according to Porphyry, while using his own chronology for Semiramis, there is no contradiction between the passage in the *Chronicon* and 804:10. In a word, what Eusebius has done is to accept Porphyry's statement that Semiramis came after Moses, but instead of retaining Porphyry's date for Semiramis, Eusebius has substituted his own.

---

[96] Ibid., pp. 12-13. [97] *Ibid*., p. 15. [98] *Ibid*., p. 52.

That this is the correct interpretation is confirmed by Eusebius' second citation of 803:26-804:10 (basilidos) in P.E. 10, 9, 485bff. There Eusebius argues much as in the passage from the Chronicon. However, it is significant that he does not quote the entire passage from Porphyry but omits the phrases in which Porphyry presents his date for Semiramis, for only thus could he insert his own, much earlier, date for Semiramis and thus attribute a much earlier date for Moses to Porphyry.

XUM

CHAPTER FIVE

PHILO'S ACCOUNT OF SANCHUNIATHON

i

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Eusebius)

(804:12) So wrote the author mentioned above [Porphyry], bearing witness to both the veracity and antiquity of the theologian. (804:13) But [Sanchuniathon] proclaims as divine not the god above all things, nor indeed the gods in heaven, but mortal men and women; nor are they of refined character, persons who would be worthy of approval for their virtue or of admiration for their love of wisdom; (804:15) but they are involved in the evil of depravity and complete wickedness. (804:16) And he testifies that these are the very same who are even yet believed to be gods by all, both in the cities and the countryside. (804:18) But receive the proofs of these things from [his own] writings.

(804:19) Philo, distributing Sanchuniathon's entire work in nine books, says in the introduction to the first book the following things about Sanchuniathon, in these very words:

(Philo)

(804:22) These being the facts, Sanchuniathon, being a very learned and very inquiring man, desiring to know, from all sources, everything from the beginning when things first took shape, with great research tracked out the [writings] of Taautos (804:25), [since] he knew that of those who were under the sun Taautos was the first to have conceived the discovery of the letters and to have begun the writing of records. (804:26) He [therefore] laid, as it were, the foundation of his work on this [Taautos], whom the Egyptians call Thouth, the Alexandrians Thoth, and the Greeks translate Hermes.

(Eusebius)

(805:1) Having said these things, [Philo] blames the more recent writers, who [came] after these events, because they violently and untruthfully interpret the stories about the gods as allegories and accounts and expositions of physical processes. Accordingly, continuing, he says.

(Philo)

(805:4) But the more recent writers on religion[1] have completely thrown out the events as they occurred from the beginning; and having invented allegories and myths, and [thus] having falsely related [the true stories] to cosmic events[2] (805:7), they established mysteries and introduced in them a lot of nonsense, so that one cannot readily perceive what truly occurred. (805:8) But [Sanchuniathon] having had access to the hidden texts found in the adyta of the temples of Ammon, [texts] composed in letters which, indeed, were not known to everyone, himself worked out the interpretation of all these [texts]; (805:11) and having completed the investigation, and having dismissed the allegories and the myth according to the elements, he accomplished his purpose. (805:13) Until, once again, the priests who succeeded him in later times wished to conceal this and return to the mythical accounts, (805:15) whence the secret, [allegorical interpretation] reared its head again, [at a time when] it had not yet reached the Greeks.

---

[1] Williams, p. 74 renders hierologōn as "authors of holy legends."

[2] Williams, p. 75, renders "earthly feelings."

(Eusebius)

(805:16) After these things he says:

(Philo)

(805:16) We [sc. I] have found out these things because we desired to know Phoenician history precisely and examined much material--and not that [preserved] by the Greeks. For the latter is self-contradictory and was composed by some people more [concerned] for polemics than for truth.

(Eusebius)

(805:20) And after other remarks [he says]:

(Philo)

(805:20) And thus it came about that we, having seen the disagreements among the Greeks, were convinced that things were as he had written. (805:22) Concerning this subject I have sedulously written[3] three books, bearing the title, The Unconventional History.

---

[3] There are two possibilities for translating pephilotimētai. The Greek verb means primarily to be earnest or zealous, and thence to do something earnestly, zealously or contentiously. The object of the zeal is, if an action, normally an infinitive; if a person or thing, normally in a prepositional phrase. The verb can also take a person or thing as a direct object, not only a cognate accusative as in Josephus BJ 1,206, but also ordinary accusatives, as in Demosthenes 1046 (Pros Phainippon 24), Philo, De Abr. 242. If our passage, as suggested by Professor Smith, is an example of this usage, Philo would

(Eusebius)

(805:23) And again after other remarks he adds:

(Philo)

(805:24) It is necessary for the sake of clarity below and for the determination of particulars, to state explicitly that (805:25) the most ancient of the barbarians, especially the Phoenicians and the Egyptians, from whom the remainder [of mankind] received [their ideas], considered as the greatest gods those who discovered things useful for life or who, in some way, benefited the peoples. (806:1) Considering them as benefactors and as the causes of many good things, [these ancients] worshiped them as divinities and, when they had gone to [their] fate, erected temples and consecrated stelai and pillars in their names (806:4) and moreover, revering them greatly, the Phoenicians also established very great festivals in their honor. (806:5) And particularly from their own kings, they gave names to the elements of the cosmos and to some of the accepted gods. (806:7) The only physical gods they recognized were the sun and the moon and the other planets and the elements and the things connected with these. (806:9) In this way they had some mortal and some immortal divinities.

---

state that he has sedulously or contentiously written three books on the topic. Cf. Orelli, p. 7. An alternative explanation was suggested to me by Professor Bickerman. The verb means not only to seek honor but also to contend for honor, or more generally to contend. Philo would thus state "concerning this subject my three books . . . contend (or polemicize)."

ii

Commentary

The passage cited contains Eusebius' introductory remarks to quotations from the introduction written by Philo for his Phoenician History, followed by the quotations themselves.

804:12-13 tauta-marturēsas.

Eusebius states explicitly his purpose in quoting Porphyry. He wants to establish that Porphyry believed that Sanchuniathon was both ancient and reliable.

804:19 eis ennea biblous.

This disagrees with Porphyry's statement in 803:3-5 that Philo's work consisted of eight books of translation. Baudissin solves this contradiction by assuming that the entire work consisted of nine books. The first book contained Philo's introduction and some translation, while the other eight books consisted of translation only. Eusebius counts nine books of translation, while Porphyry, mistakenly, only counted eight (since he considered the entire first book an introduction).[4] Another possible solution is that there were two or more editions of Philo's work in which the division of books differed.

Whatever the explanation, the statement that Philo divided Sanchuniathon's work into books may be true. Some ancient works were not divided into books,[5] and Sanchuniathon's work may not have been.

---

[4] Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," p. 454.

[5] In Ugaritic literature, for example, the division is not into books or even tablets. References to other passages are by content. See Gordon, UT, 51:IV:104-105. The Pentateuch, however, was probably

If so, Philo, "the translator," would have been the first to divide it into books. But the statement that Philo divided it into books does not prove that it was not divided previously--it may merely refer to the fact that Philo made his own division, or more probably, to the fact that Porphyry and Eusebius knew Philo's work as so divided. That either of them knew the Phoenician text (if one ever existed) is not likely.

804:19 *pasan*.

We have seen in the previous chapter that a fairly large number and variety of works were attributed to Sanchuniathon in antiquity. It is therefore tempting to suppose that *pasan* here was intended to claim that Philo was translating *all* that could be attributed to Sanchuniathon, with the implication that what was not in Philo was not genuine.[6]

804:23-4 *aph hou-synestē*.

There have been three translations offered for this clause. Bochart translated *para pantōn* as *supra omnia*,[7] that is, "*above all* Sanchuniathon wanted to know . . . " Gifford renders the clause: "the

---

divided into books before Hellenistic times since the division goes back to the Hebrew tradition. In Egypt the Book of the Dead was in chapters. Budge, *Book of the Dead*, pp. xxxiiiff. The Papyrus Harris is in effect divided into books, Breasted, *Ancient Records* IV, pp. 91-92. Concerning the Greeks, see Birt, *Antike Buchwesen*, pp. 126-139.

[6] The title of Sanchuniathon's work, as Eusebius knew it, was the *Phoenician History*. See 814:5. Eusebius and Porphyry both knew the book by the same title, and τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ Σαγχουνιάϑωνος is a description rather than title.

[7] Bochart, p. 772.

XUM

earliest history *of all the nations* from the creation of the world."[8] Nautin renders *para pantōn* as "according to everybody." This, according to Nautin, explains why Sanchuniathon, a Phoenician, searched out the records of Taautos, the Egyptian Thoth.[9]

I should like to make a fresh start. It is clear that τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς means "the things from the beginning," i.e., history. ἀφ' οὗ τὰ πάντα συνέστη must mean "from the time when everything arose." Bochart proposes translating *para pantōn* as "above all"; that is, "above all Sanchuniathon was desirous of knowing this history." However, I have not seen an instance of *para* with the genitive meaning "above" or "more than," which would justify this translation. *Para pantōn* can only mean "from" or "according to everyone," as Gifford and Nautin maintain.[10] However, Nautin's explanation of the significance of this phrase seems incorrect. The phrase does not justify Sanchuniathon's use of the works of the Egyptian Taautos=Thoth, since Eissfeldt has shown conclusively that Philo considered Taautos a native Phoenician (see below on 805:25). The significance of the "search according to all" must be sought elsewhere. Philo never states why Sanchuniathon was interested in this history. Judging from the quotations which Eusebius has preserved, one could easily conclude that Sanchuniathon was interested in determining who invented the things necessary for civilization and who originated the beliefs in the gods. If these were Sanchuniathon's concerns, his interest in the histories of all nations is clear. Sanchuniathon's search for Taautos' works is also understandable. These works are important because they are the first written and unalterable records.

---

[8] Gifford, *Eusebius*, p. 36.

[9] Nautin, p. 261.

[10] Sanchuniathon was interested in learning from everyone. The prepositional phrase modifies the infinitive. See Hdt. 2,104.

We have seen and shall see that much of the information in Porphyry and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon is of Hellenistic origin or betrays Hellenistic concerns. Combining this fact with Taautos' identification with Thoth (discussed below), the analysis of this passage may perhaps be carried a step further. Hecataeus of Abdera, in his Aegyptiaka makes Hermes (who is obviously Thoth, though Hecataeus uses only his Greek name) a great inventor. Hermes' inventions include language, the alphabet, ordinances and honors for the gods, astronomy, harmony, gymnastics, rhythmical movement, the threestringed lyre, expositions of thoughts, and the olive tree. Hermes is also described as possessing "ingenuity for devising things capable of improving the social life of man."[11] Hecataeus' tendencies are obvious in the fragment. Even gymnastics and olive culture, characteristically Greek activities (in an Egyptian context), are claimed for the Egyptian Hermes.

To return to Philo, if Sanchuniathon was interested in the history of inventions, and if Philo's source describing Sanchuniathon knew the sort of material now found in Hecataeus, Sanchuniathon's search for the works of Taautos may acquire greater significance. Taautos' writings are not only the first written and unalterable records, they are also the memoirs of a great and prolific inventor (i.e. an inventor of more than the rather restricted list of inventions ascribed to Thoth by the ancient Egyptians).[12]

---

[11] Hecataeus, FGrH 264, Frag 25,15,9; 16,1.

804:25 Taautos

Below, in 804:29, Taautos is identified with the Egyptian Thoth and the Greek Hermes. The identification of Thoth and Hermes goes back at least as far as Herodotus.[13] As Eissfeldt argues, it is nonetheless clear that Philo considers Taautos a Phoenician.[14] The three names given for Taautos--Thouth among the Egyprians, Thoth among the Alexandrians and Hermes in Greek translation (804:29)--suggest this conclusion. Furthermore, part of Sanchuniathon's purpose, according to Philo's alleged translation, is to glorify the Phoenicians, to make them the originators of the stories about the gods which were the sources of Hesiod and other Greek poets.[15] It is inconceivable that Sanchuniathon's alleged source should not be a Phoenician. Finally, Philo explicitly calls Taautos a Phoenician in 818:9.

The fragments also offer indirect proof that Taautos was considered a Phoenician. He is Kronos' counselor and ally (810:6-9:15) and it would be reasonable to assume that he shared Kronos' nationality. Kronos was the first to found a city with walls--Byblos (810:13-14). It might be objected that Kronos was also the father of Athena (812:5) and gave Athena the rule over Attica (812:5), and thus Kronos is not considered a Phoenician. However, it is likely that Philo identified

---

[12] Boylan, Thoth, pp. 99-101.

[13] Hdt. 2, 138, 4. See the commentary of How & Wells ad loc. Cf. Williams p. 39.

[14] Eissfeldt, T. und S., pp. 6-12.

[15] See 813:11-17. Cf. Eissfeldt, T. und S., p. 9 and Renan p. 307.

Athena with the Phoenician goddess Anat.[16] The gods are all Phoenicians. Phoenicians originally ruled the world, and worship everywhere--at least of the major deities--is of these great Phoenician originals. Similarly, Taautos is given dominion over Egypt on Kronos' trip south (812:17ff.).

Taautos is the inventor of writing (812:15-17), and the system of writing he discovered is hieroglyphs, as Dussaud saw.[17] However, was Taautos in fact (as opposed to Philo's claims) merely a Phoenician misspelling of Thoth, or was he an independent native Phoenician deity, later identified with Thoth on account of the similarity of their names or function? Bunsen argues for the latter conclusion,[18] citing Varro, *De Lingua Latina* 5,10,57: "*Principes dii Coelum et Terra qui in Aegypto Serapis et Isis, Taautes et Astarte apud Phoenices*, the sky and the earth are the principal deities. They are Serapis and Isis in Egypt, Taautes and Astarte among the Phoenicians." Varro, who wrote two hundred years before Philo thus assigns a definite role to Taautos. Bunsen considers this passage proof that the Phoenicians worshiped Taautos as one of their chief divinities. However, the phrase *Taautes et Astarte apud Phoenices* is only found in one very corrupt MS. of Varro's work.[19] It is therefore considered an interpolation derived from Philo.[20]

---

[16] CIS 1, 95, a bilingual of the fourth century B.C. from Cyprus, is dedicated to ענת מעז חים in the Phoenician text and 'Αθηνᾷ Σωτείρᾳ Νίκῃ.

That Philo agreed with the author of this inscription in identifying the two goddesses can be shown indirectly. Philo often identifies Greek and Phoenician deities, and whatever evidence we possess agrees with these identifications. Philo equates Melqart and Herakles, as does the bilingual CIS 1,122. Philo's equation of Kronos and El is also confirmed, by other authors if not by inscriptions.

[17] Dussaud, "Invention," pp. 334-337.

[18] Bunsen, Vol. 4, p. 225.

[19] The phrase is found only in MS. B. This Ms. is lost, and is known from the editions of P. Victorius (1535) and A. Augustinus (1554).

Eissfeldt has also argued that Taautos was a native Phoenician deity.[21] Eissfeldt concedes that the passage from Varro is an interpolation, but he argues that Taautos, the god who invented writing (804:26), is the Phoenician name of the deity, derived from his invention. In 809:9, where Taautos' birth is discussed, he is the son of Misor and the nephew of Sydyk, both of whom are named after abstractions--righteousness and justice. "Taautos," therefore Eissfeldt argues, is also to be explained as a proper noun derived from an abstraction. Following M. Noth,[22] Eissfeldt points to the expression והתוית תו in Ezek. 9:4, from the root תוה . In discussing the boundaries of the promised land in Num. 34:7, 8, 10, the Bible uses the words תתאו and והתאויתם derived from the related stem תאה . Eissfeldt proposes that the noun תאוה , "mark"/"marking" be derived from the same root and understands קברות התאוה of Num. 11:34 as originally meaning boundary marks. תאות would be the singular construct form of this noun. The god responsible for the marks of the alphabet, Eissfeldt supposed, might well be called אל תאות. In 812:15 Taautos is called theos taautos, which would be a translation and transliteration of

---

It is badly edited and full of omissions and interpolations. Collart, Varron, p. xxxiii calls MS. B more an adaptation than a MS. of Varro's work.

[20] The phrase is omitted even from the critical apparatus in Collart's recent edition. The phrase seems to have originated as an attempt to make sense of ut TA TAS EAM, which Collart understands as ut taceas eam.

[21] Eissfeldt, T. und S., pp. 12-24.

[22] Noth, Uberlieferung., p. 129.

that divine title. Later this deity was simply called תאות or Taautos. Eissfeldt concludes that since this name sounded like Thoth, and since Thoth was the inventor of writing in Egypt, the two deities were identified.[23]

Eissfeldt's arguments are weak. The construct requires an object. One cannot simply say אל תאות. One should say something like אל תאות האותיות, yet there is no such formulation in Philo. Furthermore, the etymology of תאוה is not free from suspicion, especially since קברות התאוה is perfectly comprehensible in context as "graves of lust."[24]

Lokkegaard has proposed another interpretation of Taautos' functions which would also make him a native and independent Phoenician deity. Lokkegaard bases his argument on the enigmatic biblical verse Job 38:36: מי שת בטחות חכמה או מי נתן לשכוי בינה. טחות in the verse is in parallelism with שכוי, normally translated as rooster. Therefore Lokkegaard thinks טחות must also mean rooster or cock, and he considers it the orthographic equivalent of Taautos. Taautos was not originally connected with Thoth but was the animal representative of the native Phoenician god of writing, learning and glyptic art.[25]

Unfortunately for Lokkegaard's argument, טחות appears once again in the Bible, in Ps. 51:8, in parallelism to סתום. Here the meaning "rooster" is not satisfactory. Moreover, a Phoenician god of writing, learning and glyptic art represented by a rooster is otherwise unknown.

---

[23] On Thoth as inventor see Nagel, "Thoth," p. 129.

[24] Williams, pp. 144-5 rejects Eissfeldt without explaining why.

[25] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 63-64.

Albright's interpretation of Taautos, while totally different from Lokkegaard's, also departs from Job 38:36. Albright understands Taautos as a person, as the hierophant of Sanchuniathon. In Job 38:36 he is mentioned as טחות , while שכוי in that verse is the personal name of another Phoenician hierophant. Taautos= טחות also appears in Ps. 51:8 where his name represents esoteric lore.[26]

Albright's interpretation, however, ignores a basic characteristic of the Philonic fragments. Philo, as a good Euhemerist (see below), turns gods into men; he considers the gods worshiped by people as culture heroes deified for their contributions to society. Philo does not take characters commonly conceived as men and portray them as gods. Philo's identification of Taautos with Thoth and Hermes (804:29) must mean that like Thoth and Hermes, Taautos would, by a non-Euhemerist, be considered a god, not a human hierophant. In other words, when Philo makes Taautos a wise man and great authority, that must be Euhemerization, not fact.

A proper understanding of Philo's Taautos is indirectly suggested by the same difficult verse in Job from which Lokkegaard and Albright departed. טחות in Job is simply the transliteration of the name of the Egyptian god Thoth. Thoth is appropriate to the astronomical context of the verse in his capacity as god of the calendar and of the movements of the stars.[27] Pope supposes that שכוי is not a rooster,

---

[26] Albright, YGC, pp. 244-248.

[27] Boylan, Thoth, pp. 83-87. On טחות =Thoth see Pope, Job, p. 256.

XUM

the usual meaning, but the ibis, Thoth's bird.[28] I would suggest that שבוי is neither rooster nor ibis. Ibis can be disregarded as sheer invention. Rooster is suggested by the rabbinic blessing הנותן לשבוי בינה להבחין בין יום ובין לילה. But this blessing may be an attempt to interpret the verse and understand the difficult word, rather than evidence that שכוי was a usual word for rooster. שבוי is rendered by the Targum on the verse as תרנגול ברא, the equivalent among birds of the שור הבור and Leviathan of Jewish legend. Another name for this bird in Jewish legend is the ziz bird. The latter is the mythological bird of heaven, the seer and singer of the skies.[29] As such it is an appropriate parallelism for טחות =Thoth. Both are astronomical authorities.

As Thoth became טחות for the author of Job 38:36, so he became a Phoenician god named Taautos for Philo or his source. This explanation is confirmed by the facts that no other writer knows anything about this pretended Phoenician deity and the many Phoenician inscriptions containing divine names have yielded no trace of him. Accordingly, we may conclude that Taautos is not a native Phoenician deity; he is a Phoenicianization of Egyptian Thoth. This conclusion is supported by several passages within the fragments such as 812:15-17 where Taautos invents hieroglyphs and 812:27ff. where Taautos is assigned dominion of Egypt.

---

[28] See Pope, Job, p. 256. Prof. Schmidt informs me that Pope's equation of Thoth and טחות is plausible.

[29] On the ziz bird, see Ginzberg, Legends, Vol. 1, pp. 29-30. Ginzberg, Legends, Vol. 5, p. 48, n. 139 writes that "In most of the Ziz legends the dependence upon Iranic mythology is evident." I would suggest that this conclusion must be seriously reconsidered. The Babylonians told of the Anzu or Zu bird, a god who rebelled against the divine order and stole the tablets of destiny. This mythological bird was ultimately defeated by the storm god (Marduk, Hadad, depending upon the provenance of the tablet). On the Anzu bird see ANET, pp. 111-113. The ziz bird might be a similar ornithological rebel of Canaanite mythology. His coupling with the Leviathan in Jewish legend would support such a conclusion. On the Leviathan see Cassuto, Adam, pp. 30-31.

804:27-9 *kai apo* -- *metephrasan*

No new sentence begins with *kai apo*, for the phrases which follow contain nothing which could serve as the main verb. The participle *balomenos* therefore depends on *exemasteusen* (804:25) just like *eidōs* (804:25). Bernays believed that this was difficult, for he considered the *eidōs* causal and could not understand how *balomenos* could also be causal. (One cannot say "Sanchuniathon searched. . . because he had placed the works of Taautos as a foundation." The *balomenos* clause should express the result and not the cause of the search.) Bernays therefore supposed that Eusebius, in quoting Philo, had paraphrased Philo and omitted, after the word *logou*, one or more phrases, (804:28) which provided the main verb upon which *balomenos* depended. This omitted clause(s) ended with a mention of Taautos which the *hon* (804:28) picks up.[30] However, this supposition is unnecessary. There is no reason why the first participle cannot be causal and the second consequential. The two participles need not be understood in precisely the same manner. But the Greek is undeniably awkward as it stands and the supposition that the text is corrupt is not unlikely.

804:28 *hōsper krēpida balomenos*

This passage makes Taautos Sanchuniathon's, and hence Philo's major source. This relationship is confirmed, for their cosmogonies

---

[30] Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 800, n. 4.

XUM

at least, by 807:7-9 which ascribes the cosmogony presented by Philo to the "commentaries of Taautos."[31] However, does the attribution to Taautos=Thoth of writings such as those which Philo preserved reflect ancient Egyptian concepts or does it betray a Hellenistic concern?

According to Boylan, Thoth in pre-Ptolemaic Egypt was considered the scribe god,[32] the inventor of writing,[33] and the verbal faculty of the creator god.[34] Thoth was also considered an author. In the Sethos temple at Abydos the incense was prepared "according to the writings of Thoth which are in the library."[35] Ptolemaic temples (e.g. Denderah) often boast of their complete uniformity with the plans and prescriptions of Thoth,[36] but even at the times of Ramses II (at Abydos) Thoth was considered responsible for arranging the inner decoration of the temple. The Nine gods are described as depicted "in their shape which Ptah fashioned, according to what Thoth hath written concerning their bodies in the great register(?) which is in the library."[37] Certain temple regulations were thus ascribed to Thoth and he was regarded as the framer of the rules of sacred decoration and architecture.[38]

---

[31] If Porphyry's description of Sanchuniathon is connected to Philo's (on which see below), then the temple documents and city records of 804:7-8 were presumably used in other parts of the work.

[32] In a text from the Tut-ankh-Amon shrine. Translation in ANET, p. 8.

[33] See note 12.

[34] See the Memphite Theology, translation in ANET, p. 8.

[35] Boylan, Thoth, p. 96. Boylan does not give a precise reference for the text which he translates. For a similar text of Ptolemaic date see Mariette, Denderah, Vol. 1, pl. 72a.

[36] Boylan, Thoth, p. 89.

[37] Mariette, Abydos, II, 9. Translation from Boylan, Thoth, pp. 90-91. Cf. 812:15-17 where Taautos imitates the appearances of the gods to fashion the alphabet. The argument concerning Thoth's authorship as developed here is based on the assumption that Boylan is correct in all respects. Professor Schmidt informs me that Boylan's case may not be particularly strong. This would, of course, further support the position taken here.

None of these Pharaonic works ascribed to Thoth are at all like the Hermetic literature later ascribed to him, or the similar material Philo attributes to Taautos=Thoth.[39] Festugière's conclusions concerning the date of the sources of the Hermetic literature are therefore relevant to our problem. Festugière writes:

> Ces allusions assez vagues ne permettent pas de conclure que les temples d'Egypte, sous les Pharaons aient possedé dans leur archives un ensemble d'ouvrages attribués au dieu Thoth. Par contre, il semble que des les Ptolemées il ait existé une littérature hermétique grecque.[40]

> These rather vague allusions do not allow one to conclude that the Egyptian temples, at the time of the Pharaohs possessed in their archives a collection of works attributed to Thoth. On the contrary, it seems that beginning with the time of the Ptolemies, there existed a Hermetic literature in Greek.

As in the case of the Hermetic literature, the attribution by Philo of cosmogonic and mythological works to Taautos=Thoth is a clear indication that Philo's sources for this fact in the description of Sanchuniathon were of Hellenistic date or later.

805:1-3 tauta-anagousi

The subject of this clause must be Philo since the clause is from Eusebius' introduction to a quotation from Philo's introduction to his translation (804:19-21). Furthermore, when the discussion turns to Sanchuniathon and his discovery, Sanchuniathon is introduced ho de.

---

[38] Boylan, Thoth, pp. 90-91.

[39] On the similarities between Philo's cosmogony and parts of the Corpus Hermeticum see below Chapter Six, pp. 159-161.

[40] Festugière, Revelation, Vol. 1, p. 76.

Philo can either accuse the more recent writers of *deriving* the stories about the gods *from* allegories and physical accounts and expositions (that is, the allegories and physical accounts precede the stories); or he can accuse these writers of distorting the *stories* by interpreting them allegorically and physically (the stories precede the allegories). Since 805:1-3 is from Eusebius' introduction to a quotation from Philo, the choice should be made in light of the quotation. Philo himself takes the latter course. He accuses the more recent writers of *apopempein ta men gegonota pragmata* (805:4-5), "rejecting the events as they occurred." Philo believes the "historical" stories came first. These stories were distorted by later writers with incorrect interpretations.

Further support of my translation is that according to LSJ *s.v. anagein* II, 2, *anagein* X *epi* Y means *to refer X to Y*. Thus, *ton logon ep' archēn an*. in Pl. *Lg*. 626d, means "to refer the argument to its principle." The verb can mean *to derive X from Y* but the construction is *an*. X *apo* or *ex* Y, as in A.D. *Adv*. 121.25 and *Synt*. 23.26. Since *anagein* *X* epi *Y* means *to refer X to Y* this clause should be translated, "to refer the myths to allegories" or more freely, to interpret the myths allegorically.

The difficulty with my translation is that *mythos* in 805:2 must be understood as what Philo would call the correct and "historical" stories about the gods, while throughout the Philonic quotation which follows, the word means the distorted versions, produced by the later priests, of the "historical" material (e.g. 805:5). This objection is not decisive since 805:1-3 was written by Eusebius and his usage need not be consistent with Philo's.

XUM

805:1-3 contains one further difficulty. Since Philo accuses the more recent theologians, the allegorical interpretations were current in his time. It is never stated, however, that these interpretations were current in Sanchuniathon's time. Yet Sanchuniathon searched for the true sources and rejected the allegories (805:11-13). The later priests of 805:13-14 hid Sanchuniathon's work in order to return, once again (palin) to the incorrect versions of the stories.

Perhaps we may suppose that Eusebius has omitted a section in which Philo noted that the allegorical and physical interpretations were also current in Sanchuniathon's time. Or it may be that Philo simply took for granted that, since the temples already existed in Sanchuniathon's time (as they had to, and if Sanchuniathon was to find the documents in their adyta), therefore the allegorical interpretations, official in the temples of his own time, also existed in Sanchuniathon's time. Philo may have made this assumption without being aware of the difficulty it entailed for his theory. He wanted Sanchuniathon to reject the official, priestly interpretations (as he himself did) and he did not stop to think that by making Sanchuniathon do so he asserted the antiquity of these same interpretations, which he was elsewhere concerned to represent as posterior inventions. Whatever the case, Philo informs the reader (in the section Eusebius has preserved) that the theologians who came after Sanchuniathon are to be blamed for going back to the allegories although Sanchuniathon, long before, had found the true sources and on the basis of these sources had rejected the allegorical interpretations.

Philo's accusation of the allegorizers shows his critical method. In the process, however, he has also attributed a similar critical approach

XUM

to Sanchuniathon. Such an attribution, as Williams noticed, is anachronistic,[41] and must be another of the aspects of the descriptions of Sanchuniathon betraying Hellenistic concerns.

805:7 mystēria.

The word has been rendered as "mysteries" in the technical religious sense, a meaning all but dictated by katestesan. In addition, 805:4-19 is to be compared with 813:4-22 and 818:9-15. Gruppe already noticed that the first two passages seem parallel, the former stating the general rule, the latter giving a particular example; Williams, modifying Eissfeldt, discussed also the third.[42] Our passage levels a charge against the priests, while that in 813 levels the same charge against the priest Thabion.

The first passage contains the following elements:

(1) The charge that the priests distorted the true stories by inventing allegories and making up a false relationship between these stories and cosmic events (805:4-6).
(2) The foundation of mystēria (805:7).
(3) The people who did this introduced a good deal of typhos (805:7).
(4) The truth has been distorted (805:7-8).
(5) The work of Sanchuniathon (805:8-13).
(6) The distortion of his work by later priests (805:13-15).
(7) The material preserved by the Greeks is incorrect (805:15-19).

The passage in 813 has these elements:

(1) Thabion confused and distorted the work of Sanchuniathon by mixing

---

[41] Williams, p. 37.

[42] Gruppe, pp. 371-373; Williams, pp. 146ff.

it with allegories and relating the stories to cosmic events (813:4-6).

(2) The establishment of teletai based on this distorted material (813:6-7).

(3) The people who did this greatly increased the typhos (813:7).

(4) Eisirios was one of these people (813:9-10).[43]

(5) A charge against the Greeks (813:10-21).

(6) We are so accustomed to the false stories that we no longer believe the true stories (813:21-22).

The third passage in 818 has the following:

(1) Taautos brought order into theology.

(2) His work was obscured by allegories.

(3) Generations later, the god Sourmoubelos and Thouro--also called Chousarthis--revealed Taautos' true teaching.

Element one in the first two passages corresponds with element two in the third; element three is the same in the first two passages and the same words are often used. The first and second passages state that because of the perversions it is no longer easy to perceive the truth, and both contain charges against the Greeks. Section (5) in the first corresponds to section (2) in the third.

Because of this parallelism, the establishment of mystēria in 805 must be understood in the light of the founding of teletai in 813. Mystēria accordingly must be mysteries.

Philo is no friend of the mysteries. In Philo's view they are sheer humbuggery, invented by some frauds who based them on misappropriated allegory in order to further their own pretensions. For somewhat different reasons, Lucian shares this dislike of the mysteries. Both Philo and Lucian are fighting the popular religious tendencies of their times.[44] Attributing such opposition to Sanchuniathon is anachronistic.

---

[43] On Eisirios see below Chapter Nine, pp. 272-273.

805:9 Ammouneōn

Before discussing the meaning of this word and of Sanchuniathon's discovery, it should be noted that there is no clear connection between the texts of the Ammouneōn (whatever they may be) and the works of Taautos=Thoth. There are two possibilities: the texts of the Ammouneōn may be more of Sanchuniathon's sources, in addition to the works of Taautos;[45] or, more likely, they themselves are the lost works of Taautos.[46]

There are three interpretations of Ammouneōn and the entire phrase. Bochart identified the Ammouneōn with the חמנים of Lev. 26:30. Following Rashi (ad. loc.), Bochart considered these חמנים temples of the sun god (because of the similarity of חמה and חמן).[47] The grammasi of these temples he thought texts written in a special sacred alphabet. The difficulty with Bochart's explanation is that we now know what חמנים were. Ingholt describes them as small altars for burning perfume, and they may have often been no more than small

---

[44] See Beaujeu, Religion Romaine, pp. 32-36 and pp. 165-174.

[45] If Porphyry and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon are to be combined (see n. 31 and below, pp. 113-116) the Ammouneōn texts are not only supplementary to Taautos but also to the city records.

[46] Again, if Porphyry and Philo's accounts are to be combined, the Ammouneon texts and Taautos would be the temple records in Porphyry.

[47] Bochart, p. 773.

XUM

wooden or metal bowls. These could not contain any substantial texts.[48]

Eissfeldt argued that the word *grammasi* means letters, as in 804:26-7, where they are clearly distinguished from texts or treatises (*hypomnēmata*). These letters he thought, were those of the Ugaritic alphabet, called *Ammounēon* because this alphabet was used in the region of the Amanus, which is a general designation for the area around Ugarit.[49] Dussaud has argued convincingly against Eissfeldt and shown that when an author of Philo's date uses the term *Ammounēon* the reference is probably to Egyptian temples.[50] Moreover, Ugarit is a coastal city, while the Amanus is inland.

Nautin's proposal, the third, seems closest to the truth. He notes that *apokrypha grammata* usually means secret religious books. He suggests that *Ammounēon* is an error for Ἀμμωνείων the genitive plural of Ἀμμωνεῖον, the common name in the papyri for a temple of Ammon. Nautin therefore translates: "*ayant consulté les Écritures secrètes qu'il avait trouvées dans les sanctuaires d'Ammon où elles étaient conservées*, having consulted the secret texts which he had found in the sanctuaries of Ammon where they had been preserved."[51] Nautin understands all the dative plurals as modifying *grammasi*, and notes that the separation of noun and modifier was common in Philo's period. Nautin's explanation and emendation place the probable setting of these events in Egypt. This is justified since Taautos is only a Phoenicianization of the Egyptian Thoth.

---

[48] Ingholt, "Hamman," pp. 798-799, n. 3. I accept Ingholt's identification of the חמנים without thereby accepting his connection of the god בעל חמן with the חמנים . On the latter see Teixidor, BES 1968, #98, pp. 381-382.

[49] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 10-12. Clemen, p. 11 accepts Eissfeldt.

[50] Dussaud, "Ecriture," pp. 297-298. On discoveries in temples of Ammon see pp. 98-99 of this dissertation.

[51] Nautin, p. 264. Iamblichus, *Myst*. 8,5, in which the prophet Bitys interpreted the lost works of Hermes--found in *adyta* at Sais, written in hieroglyphics--is parallel to our case. The parallel is not complete as Bitys explained these works *to* King Ammon.

Professor Smith has suggested a slight modification of Nautin's translation which makes the text clearer. Understanding all the dative plurals as modifying *grammasi* is difficult. Furthermore, Eissfeldt is correct; Philo uses *grammasi* to mean letters and not texts (804:26). Professor Smith proposed placing a comma between *Ammōneiōn* and *grammasi*. The translation would then be: "having consulted the secret [texts] found in the adyta of the temples of Ammon, [texts] composed in letters not known to all." These texts were written in some strange system of writing, presumably hieroglyphics. This translation has the further advantage of making the statement that "Sanchuniathon worked out the interpretation of these texts" clear. Sanchuniathon had to decipher the texts.

Dussaud has attempted to determine more precisely the nature of Sanchuniathon's discovery. He suggests that the texts of the *Ammouneōn* were "*textes en caractères égyptiens usités par les prêtres d'Ammon, dieu venéré à Byblos*, texts in Egyptian letters used by priests of Ammon, a god worshiped at Byblos."[52] The difficulty in Dussaud's suggestion is in his making Byblos the "site" of the supposed find. No temples of Amon have been found in the excavations of Byblos, and the Egyptians in general built very few temples to their gods in Syria-

---

[52] Dussaud, "Byblos," p. 302, n. 3.

Palestine.[53] When Wen-Amon traveled to Byblos he worshiped the portable "Amon of the Road," and never visited a local temple. Finally, the passage in Wen Amon (ii,20) in which Zakar Baal praises Amon and Egypt may be ironical and not evidence for the worship of Amon at Byblos. Sanchuniathon's "discovery" cannot therefore be imagined as taking place at Byblos; presumably it took place in Egypt, the most conspicuous--if not the only--location of temples of Ammon. If so, Sanchuniathon was conceived as a philosopher who traveled to Egypt and there discovered ancient wisdom--a figure familiar in Greek literature from at least Herodotus' time.[54]

Is there any possibility that Sanchuniathon actually discovered any texts such as those which Philo presents and in the manner which Philo describes? Such discoveries must have been made at least occasionally in antiquity, as in the case of the Shabaka stone,[55] if forgers were able to claim that they had "discovered" the works they were publishing.[56] Forgers often used this type of story,[57] and in Philo's case the evidence suggests that the account of Sanchuniathon's discovery was invented, not true. A terminus post quem for the fabrication is also apparent.

---

[53] Alt, KS, Vol. 1, p. 217, n. 3. The subjects of Alt's article are the two temples built by Egyptians in Syria-Palestine known in his time. Professor Schulman informs me that he would not be surprised if there were another such temple at Ashdod, and that one temple may have existed at Timna. If many more temples are found, Alt's thesis would have to be reconsidered, as might the argument against Dussaud developed above.

[54] See Hdt. 2, 109, on which see further K & R, pp. 77-78.

[55] See Erman, "Denkmal," pp. 918-919 and p. 925.

[56] Speyer, Bücherfunde, pp. 142-145.

[57] Ibid., pp. 125-141. Cf. the circumstances surrounding the discovery in 2 Kings 22:8ff. Perhaps the book was planted to be discovered.

A magical papyrus at Oxyrhynchus of the third century A.D. claims to be an ἀντίφραφον ἱερᾶς βίβλου τῆς εὑρετίσης[*sic*] ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ταμίοις, "Copy of the holy book found in the archives of Hermes."[58] Cumont compares this papyrus with another magical papyrus which reads: Βίβλος εὑρεθεῖσα ἐν Ἡλιουπόλει τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν ἀδύτοις ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ἱεροῖς γράμμασι, "a book found at Heliopolis in Egypt in the temple, in the *adyta*, written in sacred characters."[59] Nautin calls attention to the story of Pibechos. Ammon the god and king discovered the teachings of Thoth and hid them in an *adyton*. Ostanes found and published these texts and Pibechos translated Ostanes' work into Greek.[60] This would be an almost exact parallel to the story Philo tells concerning Sanchuniathon, particularly if the writings of the *Ammouneōn* were the lost works of Taautos=Thoth. A final reason for suspecting Philo's story is its resemblance to Euhemerus' account of the discovery of Zeus' history of his own life. This is particularly significant as Philo was a Euhemerist (see below). Euhemerus writes:

> ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἱερῷ στήλην εἶναι χρυσήν ἐν ᾗ τοῖς Παγχαίοις γράμμασιν ὑπάρχειν γεγραμμένας τάς τε Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Κρόνου καὶ Διὸς πράξεις κεφαλαιωδῶς
>
> In this temple there is a stele of gold on which is inscribed in summary, in the writing employed by the Panchaeans, the deeds of Ouranos, Kronos, and Zeus.[61]

Philo's story of Sanchuniathon's discovery is so suspiciously similar to the other stories of discovery that it too is presumably an example of the *topos* of "discovery in an *adyton*," rather than fact. Philo or his source will have used this *topos*, as others did, to give an air of reliability and antiquity to documents thought to need this help--particularly forgeries and texts of recent origin.[62] Philo's Euhemerism and the resemblances between his story and that told by Euhemerus suggest that the account of Sanchuniathon's finding the documents of the *Ammouneōn* was written after Euhemerus' work, that is after the third century B.C.

---

[58] P. Oxy.6, #886, lines 2-5.

[59] *Catal. Codd. Astr. Graec*. vii, p. 62 *ap*. P. Oxy. 6, p. 201.

[60] See Nautin, p. 286 and Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* p. 107, n. 1 and pp. 363-364.

[61] Euhemerus, *FGrH* 63, Frag. 2,5.

805:14 *autēn*.

The antecedent of this word is probably not *prosthesis* of 805:13 but the more remote *pragmateia* of 805:9. The priests wanted to hide not Sanchuniathon's purpose, but his work, which demonstrated the humanity of the gods.

805:15 *apokatastēsai*

To prevent a challenge to the traditions promoted by the priests, and to return to the incorrect accounts[63] was the purpose of hiding Sanchuniathon's book.

---

[62] See Leipoldt and Lorenz, *Heilige Schriften*, pp. 24-36.

[63] The problem is the meaning of *apokatastēsai*. The form is the first aorist infinitive of *apokathistēmi*, however the first aorist is usually causal and, as Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 802, n. 7 notes, the causal sense is difficult. If the word verb were causal and transitive, the object of the infinitive would seem to be *autēn* of 805:14. Yet one cannot say that the priests wanted to restore Sanchuniathon's work into the legendary accounts. Bernays proposes reading *apokatastēnai*, the intransitive second aorist infinitive of the same verb. He translates: "The priests wanted to hide Sanchuniathon's work and return (to believing) the incorrect accounts." The emendation is unnecessary, however, as the sense Bernays properly felt was required can be obtained without emendation. Transitive and intransitive verbs were often confused in Hellenistic Greek and transitive verbs were used in an intransitive sense. On this point see Moulten and Turner, *NT Greek*, Vol. 3, pp. 51-53.

805:15-16 ex hou-Hellēnas.

Phthasan modifies to mystikon of 805:15. The clause states that the secret interpretations used in the mysteries emerged from the work of the later priests in Phoenicia before it passed over to the Greeks. The meaning of this statement is clear in terms of the parallel passage in 813. Philo states that Thabion, after having allegorized Sanchuniathon's work, gave these allegories and physical accounts to those who founded mysteries (813:4-7). The Greeks appropriated this incorrect material and further embellished it (813:11-17). Philo thus argues that the Greek stories are double distortions of the truth. They are further embellishments of material that was already incorrect.

805:24 Paradoxos historia.

This is the title of Philo's polemical work. Paradoxos can mean incredible, contrary to expectation, irrational, or remarkable. Perhaps Philo chose this title because his book disagreed with the currently accepted interpretations. The title should then be translated, in modern terms, as The Unconventional or Non-conformist History.

The significance of the charge against the Greeks (here, in 805:18-19, and in 813) and of many of the comments Philo makes on the translation from Sanchuniathon, is clear in the light of Hellenistic historiography. Professor Bickerman has shown that Greek scholarship created a "scientific" pre-history for the Greeks. "Scientific" methods were applied to Greek mythology to create this pre-history. When, however, these same methods were applied to barbarian pre-history, the Greeks retained the framework and chronology of Greek mythology. In particular, barbarian pre-history was forced into the events of the Trojan War.[64] Hecataeus of Abdera (ca. 300 B.C.) was the first to react to this hellenocentric pre-history. Josephus argues that Hebrew history is much more ancient and better preserved than Greek history.[65]

---

[64] Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," pp. 70-71.

This tradition of barbarian reaction was alive when Philo was active and even after his death. *Corpus Hermeticum* 16,1 contains a charge against the Greeks similar to Philo's:

> Ἑρμῆς ... ἔλεγεν ὅτι δόξει τοῖς ἐντυχάνουσί μου τοῖς βιβλίοις ἁπλουστάτη εἶναι ἡ σύνταξις καὶ σαφής, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων ἀσαφὴς οὖσα καὶ κεκρυμμένον τὸν νοῦν τῶν λόγων ἔχουσα, καὶ ἔτι ἀσαφεστάτη, τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὕστερον βουληθέντων τὴν ἡμετέραν διάλεκτον εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν μεθερμηνεῦσαι, ὅπερ ἔσται τῶν γεγραμμένων μεγίστη διαστροφή τε καὶ ἀσάφεια
>
> Hermes . . . said that to those who come upon my books their composition will seem absolutely straightforward and clear, although on the contrary, it is obscure and hides the sense of the words. It will be yet more obscure when the Greeks later get the idea of translating [the books] from our language into theirs. A complete distortion of the text and total obscurity will result.[66]

A charge against the Greeks even closer to Philo's is in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 3, 32. Apollonius is in India and the Indians are surprised that he is such a decent fellow because:

> διαβάλλουσιν ... τὸ Ἑλλήνων γένος οἱ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου φοιτῶντες ἐνταῦθα σφᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς ἱερούς τε καὶ σοφοὺς ἀποφαίνοντες καὶ νομοθέτας θυσιῶν τε καὶ τελετῶν, ὁπόσας νομίζουσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἐκείνους δὲ οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς εἶναι φάσκοντες, ἀλλ' ὑβριστάς τε καὶ ξύγκλυδας καὶ ἀναρχίαν πᾶσαν καὶ μυθολόγους καὶ τερατολόγους, καὶ πένητας μὲν ἐνδεικνυμένους δὲ τοῦτο οὐχ ὡς σεμνόν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ξυγγνώμης τοῦ κλέπτειν.
>
> The visitors who come here from Egypt. . . malign the race of Hellenes, and while declaring that they themselves are holy men and wise, and the true law-givers who fixed all the sacrifices and rites of initiation which are in vogue among the Greeks, they deny to the latter any and every sort of good quality, declaring them to be ruffians,

---

[65] Josephus *C. Ap.* 1, 11-14.

[66] Translation after that of Festugière. For the date of the *Corpus Hermeticum* see Nock's remarks in his edition, p. v. See also Williams, p. 47.

> and a mixed herd addicted to every sort of anarchy, and lovers of legend and miracle mongers, and though indeed poor, yet making their poverty not a title of dignity, but a mere excuse for stealing.[67]

Philo's charge against the Greeks is obviously in the same tradition. The Phoenicians, according to Philo, have discovered the true religious traditions, but these traditions were misappropriated and distorted by the Greeks, which has led to the errors discernible in the Greek accounts.[68]

805:25-806:10

Before making detailed comments on this passage, I should note that Philo divides the deities worshiped by the most ancient barbarians into two classes: deified kings and culture heroes (805:25-806:7), and the sun, moon, planets, elements, and other immortal physical gods (806:7-10). The same classification of gods is found in Euhemerus.[69] The conclusion that Philo was a Euhemerist is obvious.

806:3 stēlas.

By chance we know from Philo himself what these stēlai were. In 817:8 Philo says that Nāsibis are stēlai. Nasibis is a transliteration of Phoenician נצב [70] or Ugaritic nṣb,[71] מצבה in Biblical Hebrew, a column or pillar dedicated to the gods.[72]

---

[67] Translation after that of Conybeare in LCL.

[68] Philo is not the sole Phoenician representative of this tradition, as will be clearer by the end of this study.

[69] Euhemerus, FGrH 63, Frag. 2,2.

[70] See CIS 1,123=Cooke, Textbook, p. 103=KAI 61. See also CIS 1,139=Cooke, Textbook p. 108=KAI 64.

[71] Gordon, UT, #1685, p. 446.

[72] On stēlai in the Phoenician religion see Bisi, Stele Puniche, pp. 23-48.

These _stēlai_, Philo says, were dedicated to the memory of dead[73] kings or benefactors. Williams properly notes that Philo's remarks are confirmed and illuminated by the passage of the epic of Aqhat which mentions erecting _stēlai_ for ancestors as a primary task of a son.[74]

806:3 _rhabdous_.

These are wooden sticks or pillars. It is known that wooden staves were employed in the worship of some ancient Semitic deities, including Phoenician gods.[75] Whether these staves are to be identified with the Biblical _Asherah_ (of Deut. 16:21),[76] or whether the Biblical _Asherah_ was a wooden image of the goddess Asherah, known from the Ugaritic texts,[77] is uncertain. We know of the use of wooden staves in Phoenician cults and Philo refers to this usage.

806:5 _exairetōs - epethesan_.

The meaning of these phrases is elucidated by 809:15ff. We learn there that Ouranos and Ge were originally names of mortals, given to the sky and earth on account of their beauty. This is a specific example of the principle stated here.[78]

---

[73] _Eis to chreon_ of 806:2 is, of course, a euphemism for dying. See Gifford, _Eusebii Pamphili_ Vol. 4, p. 38.

[74] See Gordon, _UT_, II Aqht:I:27. Williams, p. 153.

[75] Reed, _Asherah_, pp. 99-101, figs. 11, 13, 15.

[76] This is the opinion of the translators of NJPS. See their translation of Deut. 16:21.

[77] Reed, _Asherah_, pp. 2 and 37.

[78] Cf. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 804, n. 9.

iii

As presented by Eusebius, this is the end of the quotations from Philo's introduction to his translation of Sanchuniathon. I believe it possible that Eusebius has preserved one further paragraph from that introduction, but that this paragraph has been misplaced within the account of the origins of mankind.

This passage is 807:10-19 (atolmiai) in Jacoby's edition. The following is a translation of the text as edited by Jacoby:

(Eusebius)

(807:10) After these things, mentioning the names of the winds Notos, Boreos and the others, he continues:

(Philo)

(807:11) But these [were the] first [men] who consecrated the products of the earth and considered them divine; (807:12) and they worshiped those things upon which they and all those who either followed or preceded them continued to live; (807:14) and they established offerings of drink and incense. (807:14) But they reserved pity, compassion, and weeping for the departing growth of the earth, and for the first origin of living things from the earth, and for [their origin] from each other, and for their end when they departed from life.

(Eusebius)

(807:17) And he continues:

(Philo)

(807:17) These were the notions [expressed] in [their] worship, corresponding to their weakness and their lack of daring at that time.

This passage, as presented by Jacoby, has been edited by comparison with another passage in P.E. 1,9,5. The above passage as found in the MSS. lacks 807:14-16 ("they reserved" - "from life") and also "at that time" at the end of the above translation. The 1,9,5 passage has these elements and also has an introduction which is a slightly different version of 806:7-10; it omits Eusebius' reference to mentioning the names of the winds and begins "And [you find] that to these [physical gods] the earliest [of men] consecrated" instead of reading "But these [were the] first [men] who consecrated," that stands in the above text. Jacoby rightly saw that the two passages were variants of the same text (and therefore inserted in the 807 passage the material lacked in the MSS). But he failed to see that the original position of the text was indicated by the introduction of the 1,9,5 passage--that, being a variant form of 806:7-10, shows that the rest should be read as a continuation of that text.

This inference is confirmed by the difficulty of explaining the 807 passage in its current position. It speaks of houtoi ge prōtoi (807:11) yet, as Orelli noted, there is no logical antecedent for this phrase.[79] Furthermore, it is clearly implied that humans consecrated the products of the earth. These humans cannot be Protogonos and Aion of 807:19ff., since the story of their birth has not yet been told. Orelli therefore suggests that Eusebius has omitted the account of the birth of the first humans (from Boreos and Notos, analogous to the birth of Protogonos and Aion from Kolpia in 807:19). These were, in the original, the antecedents of houtoi and they consecrated the products of the earth. While the difficulty which Orelli senses is real, his solution seems incorrect. Protogonos' name implies that he is the very first man. Secondly, "those who consecrated . . ." cannot be the very first men since it is explicitly stated that they consecrated those things upon which they themselves and their descendants and predecessors lived (807:13).

---

[79] Orelli, p. 12, n. 9. Bunsen Vol. 5, p. 812, n. 9 was also disturbed by this passage. Clemen, p. 40 saw the possible connection with 1,9,5 but does not propose moving the text.

In this regard Wagenfeld is perhaps most interesting of all. Wagenfeld was intelligent, if unscrupulous. In his forgery of Philo's Phoenician History, pp. 10-11 Wagenfeld omits the entire passage. Perhaps Wagenfeld saw the passage did not fit its context and therefore thought it an interpolation and hoped, by omitting it, to be able to pass off his text as more primitive, better preserved, less interpolated than the common form.

The difficulty which Orelli sensed not only remains but is greater than he realized. The statements about the religious notions of these people (807:11-17) seem to contradict the discussion in Philo's introduction. Furthermore, 807:10-19 disrupts the logical and natural sequence of events: the beginnings of the world (806:15-26), the birth of animals (806:27 - 807:5), and the birth of mortal men (807:19).

These difficulties disappear if we consider 807:10-19 part of Philo's introduction, and place it immediately after 806:10. The two passages which discuss the religious ideas of the ancients (805:25-806:10; 807:10-19) will thus be together. Houtoi will have an antecedent, hoi palaitatoi of 805:25. The winds Notos and Boreos are excellent examples of the ta toutois synaphē of 806:9, and in fact are mentioned by Euhemerus, whom Philo followed, as examples of immortal deities.[80] In addition, 807:16-19 is an excellent conclusion for the entire discussion begun at 805:25.

---

[80] Euhemerus, FGrH 63, Frag. 2,2.

It might be objected that since 1, 9, 5, is a summary of Philo's views, the order there need not be indicative of the order in the original, and thus the fact that one sentence follows another in 1, 9, 5, need not indicate that they followed each other immediately in the original. However, this objection is not conclusive, since a summary need not alter the original order.

Having established that 807:10-19 belongs after 806:10, one important difference between the passages in 807 and 1, 9, 5 (as found in the manuscripts), deserves closer analysis. According to 1, 9, 5, the products of the earth were consecrated *to the worship of the physical deities (hoti toutois aphierosan)*; while the passage in 807 omits the *toutois* and thus must be understood as stating that the products of the earth themselves were consecrated or worshiped. Our problem is this. Is the version which retains the *toutois* (and conforms to the usual construction with *aphieroō*)[81] correct or should we prefer the version which omits that word?

There is some support for the version of 807, the consecration of the products as independent deities. The passage of 1, 9, 5, is a summary, while 807 is a direct quotation and the version of the latter should be more reliable. Furthermore, according to the reading of 807, "the things upon which they continued to live" (1, 9, 28a8) would refer to the products of the earth and not to the elements, and it is easier to understand "these things" as the sources of nourishment. Finally,

---

[81] The usual construction is *aph*. X (in the accusative) to Y (in the dative). In later times the word was used without an indirect object and one could write *aph*. X, meaning to consecrate X. See *Ep. Barn*. 16,2.

XUM

after the quotation from Philo in 1, 9, 5, Eusebius cites a passage from Porphyry *De abst*. 2, 5, where Porphyry quotes Theophrastus. Theophrastus argues that the cosmic deities were worshiped by offerings of the fruit of the earth. One might conclude that Eusebius introduced the *hoti toutois* into Philo in order to make him fit the Theophrastean scheme.

In my opinion, however, the evidence in support of the version of 1, 9, 5 understanding the products of the earth as consecrated *to* the worship of the physical gods, is decisive. The usual construction with *aphieroō* is retained, and Philo thus confirms Theophrastus. Moreover, there is thus a parallelism in the descriptions of the two classes of divinities. Philo first defines the mortal divinities (805:7-806:1). He then describes the cult associated with these deities (806:1-5). After the transition to the immortal divinities (806:5-7), Philo defines the immortal divinities (806:7-10). If one reads next *toutois* . . . *aphierosan* as in 1, 9, 5, this sentence describes the cult of the immortal deities, and states that the products of the earth were offered to the sun, moon, stars, elements, and the other physical gods. Thus with regard to both categories of gods, Philo first defines and gives examples of the category and then describes their worship. Finally, it is possible to understand ταῦτα ἀφ' ὧν αὐτοί τε διεγίνοντο as referring to the sun, moon, and the elements (Cf. 807:23-26). The only remaining objection to preferring the *toutois* of 1, 9, 5, is that this passage is an indirect quotation. Indirect quotations, however, sometimes reflect the contents of the original more accurately than do (slightly inaccurate) direct citations.

This proposed reconstruction cannot be accepted unless the sequence of ideas in the reconstructed original can be shown. Since neither 1, 9, 5

XUM

nor 807 preserve the hypothetical original structure precisely, it will be necessary to take elements from both passages to establish the sequence.

As was noted above, Philo's description of the religious ideas of the ancients began with the definition of the mortal deities (805:7-806:1) and the depiction of the worship of these deities followed (806:1-5). After the transition to the immortal divinities (806:5-7), Philo described the immortal gods (806:7-9). The *hōste* clause (806:9-10), which might seem to summarize and close the discussion, is a Euhemeristic sneer--an aside aimed at those who believe in other deities. Philo next mentioned Notos, Boreos and the rest (of the winds) as further examples of the immortal gods. In this, as was shown above, he was following his authority, Euhemerus. This element is, of course, from 807. Philo then described the cult of the immortal divinities and their worship with offerings of drink and incense made from the products of the earth (accepting the *toutois* of 1, 9, 5). We may imagine the Philonic original as containing a *toutois* after *aphierosan* of 807:11.

The next sentence asserts that, by contrast to the sacrifices and libations offered the cosmic deities, pity, compassion, and weeping were reserved for the departing growth of the earth, and the birth and death of animals were mourned.[82] The weeping for the departing growth of the earth describes the lamentations at harvest time well-known among the peoples of the Near East.[83] These were commonly explained as mourning for the death of a god, and Philo is probably criticizing that explanation by remarking that the first (and more sensible) men worshiped only great men and immortal--qua physical--gods. Therefore they had no occasion to weep for them and (properly) reserved weeping and compassion for the transient vegetable, animal, and human lives that did not deserve deification. There may also be a reflection here on the Egyptian practice of mourning at the death of sacred animals.[84] The implied argument is that which Christian polemic was to make classical--if properly mourned, as transient, not divine; if divine, then eternal, therefore not properly mourned.

---

[82] I take *zōiōn* in the usual manner and translate it as "animals." The word can mean living thing, in a general sense, and include plant life, as in Plato, *Timaeus* 77B. This latter usage is rare and may be exclusively philosophical. Furthermore, the statement that "pity, compassion, and weeping were reserved for the origin of *zōiōn* from each other" fits animals better than plants. Most important of all, the birth of *zōiōn* is spoken of as distinct from the growth of the earth.

What is puzzling and surprising in Philo is the statement that the birth of animals, at first from the earth, then from each other, is mourned. The idea that animals are born directly from the earth is not at all remarkable in view of the widespread belief of the ancients in spontaneous generation.[85] Rather, the notion that the birth of animals was mourned is highly unusual. To the best of my knowledge, this practice is not mentioned in any other ancient document. If this practice existed and was widespread in later antiquity, it would have been sufficiently odd to attract the attention of the ethnographers. Perhaps we ought therefore assume that the practice either was local or temporary. However, there is one further possibility which ought not be overlooked. Philo or his sources may have added this mourning in order to balance rhetorically mourning at the death of animals. Another possibility is that we have here another corruption in the text or notes of Eusebius, and that Philo actually said "They reserved pity, compassion and weeping for the departing growth of the earth and for the race of animals, [both] that first [born] from the earth and that from other animals, in their death, at the time when they departed from life."[86] All these explanations remain speculations, and the interpretation of these phrases remains an unsolved question.

---

[83] Gaster, Thespis, pp. 30-31.

[84] Hdt. 2,65-76, especially 2,66.

[85] See Guthrie, ITB, pp. 41-45.

This sentence on the mourning of the departing growth of the earth and the birth and death of animals has no function in the tight structure of Philo's introduction as preserved by Eusebius. It is irrelevant to both the definition and the cult of either the mortal or the immortal divinities. If Eusebius has preserved the full structure of the introduction, it is tempting to suppose that this sentence was an aside, occasioned by the mention of the use of plants in the cult of the physical gods. However, it is equally probable that Philo discussed fully the agricultural religion of the ancients in sections which Eusebius has not preserved except for this single sentence. The final sentence in the reorganized introduction, 807:17-19, is a perfect conclusion to the discussion begun at 805:25.

Full proof of my hypothesis that 807:10-19 should be read after 806:10, requires an explanation of how the passage was misplaced. It is clear that Eusebius himself knew the correct order since he preserved that order in 1, 9, 5. The error must be attributed either to a deliberate change by Eusebius or to an error in copying the text of the *P.E.* Such an error would have had to occur early, since the incorrect order is found in all the MSS. of the *P.E.* Since I can find no reason for Eusebius to deliberately alter the order, I have investigated the latter alternative.

---

[86] This possibility, first suggested to me by Professor Smith, involves understanding *genesei* as "for the race"--possible but unlikely--and replacing the *kai* before *teleutēi* by *en* (or reading *kata teleutēn*). The Greek of the whole sentence, emended or not, is very odd, especially because of the lack of articles where one would expect them.

If a scribe realized that he had omitted some material, he would copy the omitted material in the margin or at the bottom of the page and indicate by marks both the proper place of the material and the fact that it had been omitted.[87] If those marks faded or were accidentally erased, a later scribe might misplace the passage. In our case it is easy to see why a scribe might have put 807:10-19 in its current position. This passage begins with a discussion of the winds Notos and Boreos. In the passage which follows, the wind Kolpia is the father of Protogonos and Aion. 807:10-19 was misplaced before the passage concerning Kolpia because both discussed winds.[88] The opportunity for error was increased by faulty quotation of 807:10-19, i.e. by Eusebius' (or somebody's) omission or corruption of the *toutois* which connected the paragraph to 806:10. (It is possible that Eusebius did not omit the *toutois* but that the scribe, when he misplaced 807:10-19, removed or emended the *toutois* because he did not understand its function in the improper position.

---

[87] See Kenyon, *Books and Readers*, p. 71.

[88] The mistake would have been made by associative organization. A good example of this type of organization is in the Mishnah, Gittin 4:2-5:9. Gittin 4:2 contains an example of תקון עולם (a rabbinic decree altering the law for the benefit of society) related to divorce. The Mishnah continues 4:3-5:9 and presents many examples of such decrees unrelated to divorce.

XUM

I must concede that my attempts to remove some of the difficulties involved in reading 807:10-19 after 806:10, such as the attempt to remove the problem posed by the hōste clause in 806:9-10, are not wholly satisfying. Nonetheless, I believe that these difficulties are not nearly as great as those which should be met if one were to keep 807:10-19 in its current place.

iv

Having concluded the discussion of the quotations from Philo's introduction to his supposed translation of Sanchuniathon, several further questions may be asked. Is the passage from Porphyry on Sanchuniathon, discussed in the previous chapter, original to Porphyry, or are Porphyry's remarks based on what he read in Philo? Or are both Porphyry and Philo drawing their information on Sanchuniathon from a common source with either one or both reworking that common source to suit his polemical purposes.

It would seem natural that Porphyry should faithfully reflect Philo because Philo is one of the two known sources concerning Sanchuniathon prior to Porphyry, and because Porphyry mentions Philo's translation of Sanchuniathon at the end of his biographical sketch (804:11-12) and in De Abst. 2,56=803:3-5. Nautin, however, has called attention to the discrepancies and contradictions between Porphyry and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon.[89]

Philo, Nautin argues, simply describes Sanchuniathon as a learned and curious man (804:22-23). Philo does not date Sanchuniathon.[90] The only important fact he reports concerning Sanchuniathon is the latter's use of the works of Taautos and discovery of the documents of the Ammouneōn. Porphyry, however, states that Sanchuniathon's work was based on the book of Hierombalos, which in turn, was dedicated to King Abibalos and approved by him and by the investigators of truth at Hierombalos' time. Porphyry placed Sanchuniathon at the time of the Trojan War. Furthermore, Porphyry describes Sanchuniathon's sources as city records and temple documents, and not as the writings of Taautos. All this, according to Nautin, suggests that Porphyry is reworking the description of Sanchuniathon given by Philo in order to make Sanchuniathon seem more official, ancient and reliable. Nautin considers the fact that Eusebius must quote Porphyry (and not Philo directly) decisive proof that Eusebius did not find in Philo what he found in Porphyry, and that Porphyry did retouch the Philonic account for his own polemical purposes.

---

[89] Nautin, pp. 271-272.

[90] Nautin maintains that Philo does not date Sanchuniathon, but

Eissfeldt interprets the same data oppositely.[91] Porphyry, he argues, had independent knowledge of Sanchuniathon. This knowledge was the basis of his remarks in the quotation. Philo drew on the same tradition but was less specific with regard to Sanchuniathon's dates, generally more vague, and made Sanchuniathon's sources secret temple texts, in order to strengthen his Euhemeristic reworking of Sanchuniathon.

The ease with which Eissfeldt can propose reversing Nautin's conclusions shows the weakness of both arguments. The relationship

---

as we shall see this is not wholly correct. Unlike Porphyry, Philo does not directly date Sanchuniathon, but does date him indirectly. When Philo maintains that Hesiod and other Greek poets based their works on perverted versions of Sanchuniathon's books, 813:4-22, he must be dating Sanchuniathon prior to Hesiod.

[91] Eissfeldt, S. von B., pp. 36-46.

between Porphyry and Philo is much more complex than either scholar supposed. Philo discusses Sanchuniathon's use of the writings of Taautos and the documents of the Ammouneōn. The greatest enemies of the truth, in Philo's view, are some priests, therefore Porphyry probably did not derive from Philo the report that Sanchuniathon used the works of the priest Hierombalos.

The key to the relationship between Porphyry's and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon is the supposition, suggested in the previous chapter, that Porphyry has combined two descriptions of Sanchuniathon. When Porphyry writes of the Sanchuniathon, the authority on Jewish history who used the work of Hierombalos, he is following some non-Philonic source. Porphyry, as a Tyrian, could well have had access to such a source.

The second part of Porphyry's description of Sanchuniathon, his use of the city and temple records may be based on Philo. The city and temple records may be an elaboration or alternative description of Philo's writings of Taautos and documents of the Ammouneōn. Porphyry's use of these Philonic traditions would justify his reference to Philo's translation. Thus his portrait of Sanchuniathon would emerge as a composite of independent information and material derived from Philo.[92]

Another question which must be considered is how Eusebius knew Philo. Bunsen argued vigorously that Eusebius did not know Philo directly but only from quotations preserved by Porphyry.[93] Among more recent scholars, Gifford shares this opinion.[94] They would consider not only 804:26-805:12 a quotation from Porphyry but also the entire selection until 813:23, where Eusebius states that Porphyry testifies to the truth of the information contained in the quotations he has cited; or perhaps even all the material to the end of Book One of the P.E. This interpretation of the quotation from Porphyry at 804:26-805:12 and of the appeal to Porphyry's authority at 813:23, misses the significance of Eusebius' use of Porphyry. These passages do not prove that Eusebius found the Philonic material in Porphyry. They only show that Eusebius wanted to establish (and remind the reader) that Porphyry considered Sanchuniathon reliable, in order to free himself from the suspicion of having fabricated the Philonic fragments and in order to embarrass Porphyry with Sanchuniathon's opinions. This attempt to determine how Eusebius know Philo is unsuccessful, and the question remains unanswered and is perhaps unanswerable. There is, however, no reason to doubt the obvious--that Eusebius knew Philo's work as a whole and, realizing that Philo would be useful for his attack on paganism, arranged to have some juicy passages excerpted.

---

[92] Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," p. 454 reached a similar conclusion. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 51 who asserts that the two parts of Porphyry's description are not incompatible. More surprising is Williams, pp. 141-143 who maintains that Porphyry has combined two different but not contradictory accounts.

[93] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 799, n. 3.

V

The evidence presented on one crucial point merits recapitulation before passing to the next chapter. Almost all the information concerning Sanchuniathon presented by both Porphyry and Philo is of Hellenistic date or betrays Hellenistic concerns. Porphyry's statement that Hierombalos, Sanchuniathon's source, dedicated his book to

---

[94] Gifford, Eusebius, p. 36.

XUM

Abibalos is of Hellenistic date. Porphyry's date for Sanchuniathon, before or at the time of the Trojan War, is an example of the attempt of barbarian historians to prove their sources older than Homer. In Philo's account, Sanchuniathon's use of the writings of Taautos=Thoth and the sort of writings attributed to Taautos=Thoth are both akin to the Hellenistic Hermetic literature. The critical method ascribed to Sanchuniathon is an anachronism, while Philo's story of the discovery of the lost writings of the *Ammouneōn* is a *topos*. The terminus post quem for Philo's story is Euhemerus, whose theories on ancient religion Philo, and supposedly Sanchuniathon, shared.[95]

---

[95] Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 88, n. 2, suggests that Euhemerism was Philo's own pet theory and that this theory can be found even in works which Philo admitted to be writing on his own. Eissfeldt points to 821:18-21, a fragment from Philo's biographical and geographical work. The god Poseidon is there spoken of as if he were a mortal. Philo's direct dependence on Euhemerus is thus clear even if Renan, Dornseieff and Albright are correct in arguing that the nature of the Phoenician religion was such that it lent itself readily to Euhemeristic analysis. See Renan, p. 263; Dornseieff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," pp. 231-233; Albright, *YGC*, p. 223. The Euhemerism attributed to Sanchuniathon thus remains a criterion for dating. See Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 83; Williams, p. 50 & pp. 152-153.

XUM

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER FIVE

I am grateful to Professor Smith for calling to my attention the fact that a comparison of the context of the sentence 806:7-9 in p. 806 and Eusebius P.E. 1, 9, 5, affords an insight into Eusebius' reliability and his use of sources. It is clear that the original order is as in 805:25-806:10: the mortal divinities and their cult, the transition to the immortal divinities and the description of the immortal divinities. In 1, 9, 5, Eusebius has retained only the description of the immortal divinities, 806:7-9. The reason for the omission of the first three quarters of the original Philonic passage is clear. Eusebius' purpose in the section which begins in 1, 9, is to prove that "the ancients worshiped no other gods than the celestial luminaries, knowing nothing of the god of the universe, nor even of the erection of carved images, nor of daemons."[96] (One reason Eusebius may have analyzed paganism in this manner is Deut. 4:19, which Eusebius himself quotes (1, 9, 30b).) Philo's original passage, if quoted in full, would clearly contradict Eusebius' contention, since it discusses the mortal benefactors of humanity deified by a grateful posterity. Philo implies that the worship of these culture heroes preceded the worship of the physical gods when he states that the names of Phoenician kings were given to the elements of the cosmos (806:5-7). Eusebius could not quote the entire Philonic passage in 1, 9, 5, without contradicting his own argument. He therefore quoted 806:7-9 which, out of context, would not disagree with his contention.

---

[96] This is the heading of the first part of 1, 9 as it appears on p. 27b.

When Eusebius turns to the Philonic fragments quoted at the end of 1, 9 (804:22 - 806:14), his purpose is to prove that "the stories about the gods among other nations (i.e.,not the Phoenicians and Egyptians) are of later introduction."[97] The review of Phoenician theology is supposed to prove this. Philo's words do support Eusebius' contention. Philo argues that the Greeks received distorted versions of the true Phoenician stories about the gods (805:15-16). However, in presenting a review of Phoenician history, Eusebius quoted the entire section 805:25 - 806:10 and thus exposed his unscrupulous use of 806:7-9 in 1, 9, 5.

This analysis combined with the appendix to the previous chapter confirm the conclusions concerning Eusebius' reliability and the difficulty of interpreting Philo presented in the third chapter. Eusebius did not consciously alter the words of the texts he quoted (although occasionally his quotations may be sloppy), but he did not always present the quotations in full or in the proper context, and did not always interpret his sources correctly. The author's actual words, which Eusebius has on the whole correctly preserved, may sometimes prevent our being misled by Eusebius' errors or his deliberate deceptions, but we are not always so fortunate as in the comparison of 806:7-9 and 1, 9, 5. When there is no other evidence Eusebius can easily mislead his reader. All this should serve as a reminder of the tentativeness of all interpretations offered for Philo.

---

[97] This is the heading of the last part of 1, 9, as it appears on p. 30d.

CHAPTER SIX

THE COSMOGONY

i

As this chapter is the first in which fragments of Philo's supposed translation of Sanchuniathon will be discussed, a few general remarks seem appropriate at the outset. In the extant fragments Philo does not date Sanchuniathon directly. Philo's date for Sanchuniathon can, however, be inferred from 813:4-22. Sanchuniathon's work was deformed by misinterpretation and eventually reached Greece to become the basis of Hesiod's Theogony. Sanchuniathon, according to Philo, must therefore have lived before Hesiod--long enough prior to Hesiod for the intervening process of misinterpretation and transmission to be completed. A date late in the second millenium or early in the first millenium would therefore seem proper.[1] Porphyry, on the other hand, dates Sanchuniathon directly--at the time of the Trojan War. Eusebius (following Porphyry and perhaps Philo's allusions) calls Sanchuniathon a most ancient man, who lived before the Trojan War. Sanchuniathon's writings, therefore, allegedly date from the late second millenium B.C. Nevertheless, as was concluded at the end of the previous chapter, the data in Porphyry and Philo's description of Sanchuniathon are derived from a Hellenistic milieu. This must arouse suspicion concerning the texts which Philo presents as his translation of Sanchuniathon. Do the fragments reflect ancient Phoenician beliefs, as Philo claims, or do they reflect the beliefs of Hellenized Phoenicians?

---

[1] It is impossible to be more precise. Two crucial questions are unanswerable: (1) when Philo dated Hesiod (for the problem in general see West, Theogony, p. 40); and (2) how much time to allow for the process of transmission.

Testing the antiquity of beliefs or doctrines is complicated by the fact that some elements may be old, others new. Thus names of gods or festivals may survive long after the notion of the god or practices in the festival have changed completely. This may have occurred in Phoenician religion. Another, closely related, source of difficulty is the fact that some elements, like names, are handed down from one text to another, relatively unchanged,[2] so their occurrence at a late date is no proof that they were directly derived from an ancient text. Several deities mentioned by Philo may have been otherwise virtually unknown or totally incomprehensible before the discovery of the Ugaritic epics,[3] yet this does not prove that Philo's immediate sources were as ancient as the Ugaritic literature. Such examples (and even the agreement of the larger structure of a relatively recent text with the structure of an older text) prove no more than that the older text may have been ultimately, a source of the more recent work. Only if the congruences between the texts include essential and characteristic elements ought we conclude that the more ancient text was an immediate source of the more recent one and/or that the latter preserved intact and relatively unaltered extensive passages contained in the former.

---

[2] Consider the history of the deities El, Baalsamen, Anat, Reshef and Baalat Gebal. El, an important figure in the Ugaritic epics, is named in the Azitawada inscription (KAI 26 A III, 18). Philo describes El as having six wings (812:21ff), a description confirmed by numerous Byblian coins. See below Chapter Nine, pp. 264-266.

Baalsamen is mentioned in KAI 4,3 from Byblos of the tenth century, as well as in the Azitawada inscription (KAI 26 A III, 18). He is also found in a Carthaginian inscription (KAI 78,2).

Anat is one of the principal figures of the Ugaritic epics. A bilingual inscription to her, CIS I, 95 in which she is identified with Athena has been discussed several times.

The god Reshef is found compounded in several names known from Ugarit, such as *bn ršp* (Gordon, *UT*, 64:12). He was very popular on Cyprus and many Cypriot names are compounded with his, such as רשפחץ of CIS I, 10, 4. On Reshef see also Teixidor BES 1969, #86 and BES 1970, #68 & 69.

Baalat Gebal is often mentioned in the Amarna letters (See Mercer, *EA Tablets*, Vol. 2, p. 901 for a list of passages). She is also mentioned in KAI 5,2 from Byblos and dated to ca. 925 B.C., and in CIS I,2 of the fourth or fifth century B.C.

These methodological principles are relevant to the analysis of Philo's cosmogony (and the related doctrines which Eusebius classifies as his "zoogony," together 806:15-807:9),[4] the subjects of this chapter. Philo claims to have derived these doctrines from a Phoenician source, Taautos (807:7-9) via Sanchuniathon. Whoever Taautos or Sanchuniathon may be, it is clear that the ultimate source of the cosmogony and zoogony was Phoenician. The enigmatic Mōt of 806:20, the Zophasēmin of 806:25, and the poetic form of the whole (all discussed below) establish this point beyond doubt.[5]

---

[3] The deities in this category are Mot and Chusor. Philo mentions a Mouth, god of death, in 812:9-11. This is of course the Ugaritic Mot. Philo also mentions a certain Chusor who invented iron and its use (808:21ff.). Although Chusor may be intended in the personal name עבדכשר (on which see Teixidor, BES 1970, #69), his functions were not understood until we learned of the Ugaritic artisan god kṯr wḫss. For an example of the earlier lack of comprehension see Meyer, GdA, Vol. II,2, p. 180, n. 5. Cf. Eissfeldt, RS, pp. 28-29.

[4] I will argue below for the unity of these passages and for their derivation from one source. I will therefore use the term "cosmogony," interchangeably with "cosmogony and zoogony," as titles for the passages discussed.

[5] See Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," cols. 1495-1496, n. *

Before discussing other sources of the cosmogony, less obvious than the ultimate Phoenician source, let us turn to the text.

ii

(Eusebius)

(806:11) Philo, having expounded these things in the Introduction, begins next the translation of Sanchuniathon, and sets forth the Phoenician theology more or less as follows:

(806:15) He posits as the beginning of all things dark and windy mist, or a blast of dark mist, and a turbid, watery _chaos_, dark as Erebos. (806:16) These things were boundless, and throughout a long period of time had no bound. He says:

(Philo)

(806:17) And when the wind loved its own primary elements and a mixture resulted, that plexus was called Pothos (Desire). This [plexus] is the source of the creation[6] of all things. But he [Pothos][7] did not know his own creation. (806:20) And from his connection [with the wind], _Mōt_ was born of the wind. (806:21) Some say that [_Mōt_] is slime, others the putrefaction of a watery mixture. (806:22) And from this [putrefaction] was born every seed of creation and [the] origin of all [things]. (806:23) And there were some living things which had no sense perception, from which living beings possessed of intellect were born. And they were called _Zophasēmin_, that is observers of the heavens, and they were formed like the shape of an egg. And *Mōt* blazed forth the sun and the moon, the stars and the great luminous bodies.[8]

---

[6] "Creation," is used throughout to render Greek _ktisis_. Concepts such as _creatio ex nihilo_ should not however be read into Philo.

[7] For _auto_ read _autos_. See the commentary _ad loc_.

(Eusebius)

(806:27) Such then is their cosmogony, which openly introduces godlessness. Let us next see how he says the generation of animals arose. He says, accordingly:

(Philo)

(806:28) And when the air burst into light, on account of the burning of both the land and sea, there arose winds and clouds and great downpourings of the waters of heaven and floods. (806:31) And when [the waters] were set apart and separated from their original place on account of the sun, (807:1) then all things met each other again in the air and clashed together, thunders and lightnings were produced. (807:3) And as a consequence of the crashing of the thunders, the intellectual beings mentioned above were aroused, (807:4) and as a consequence of the sound they were frightened, (807:5) and male and female were set in motion in earth and sea.

(Eusebius)

(807:6) Such is their account of the generation of animals. After these things, the same author continues and says:

(Philo)

(807:7) These are the things which were found written in the cosmogony of Taautos and in his commentaries from both conjectures and proofs which his intellect saw, and found, and revealed to us.

---

[8] For Jacoby's ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη I have read ἥλιόν τε καὶ σελήνην. See the commentary *ad loc*.

iii

One of the things which distinguishes the cosmogony from the other fragments is the constant use of the conjunction kai. This conjunction is used approximately thirty times in twenty lines. Renan, the first to notice this usage, considered it a Semiticism, a reflection of the recurrent waw in Hebrew.[9] Lagrange and Clemen continued this line of argument, and Clemen added that the original which Philo supposedly translated may have been poetic.[10] Clemen does not explain this comment, but merely notes several similarities between Philo's cosmogony and the first chapter of Genesis.

Clemen's hint can be developed further, as was done by Hölscher.[11] The author of Philo's source(s) for the cosmogony and zoogony clearly used the technique of poetic parallelism--the technique of Biblical and Ugaritic poetry--in composing his work. Descriptions of events are often repeated, with little new information added in repetition. On other occasions the text offers two alternative explanations with little difference between the alternatives.[12] The list below includes

---

[9] Renan, p. 255. Cf. Gruppe, p. 376.

[10] Clemen, p. 39; Lagrange, p. 408.

[11] Hölscher, "Anaximander," pp. 394-395. I reached the same conclusion independently. See also Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 53.

[12] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 807, n. 1 was most confused by the tautologies and repetitions, which he attempted to remove by emendation. Williams although citing Hölscher's article (in his bibliography,

XUM

some of the clearer examples:

(1) 806:15 ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη // ἢ πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους. The only differences are the substitution of *pnoē* for *pneuma*, and the shift from an adjectival to a nominal construction.

(2) 806:16-17: ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἄπειρα // καὶ διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. There is no difference between the statements.

(3) 806:18: ἐγένετο σύγκρασις// ἡ πλοκὴ ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη Πόθος . After stating that a *sygkrasis* arose, the text refers again to the mixture (as a *plokē*) and says that this *plokē* was called Pothos.

(4) 806:21-22: τινές φασιν ἰλύν // οἱ δὲ ὑδατώδους μίξεως σῆψιν . The alternatives are very similar--mud or the putrefaction of a watery mixture.

(5) 806:22-23: πᾶσα σπορὰ κτίσεως // καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὅλων . Once again, a single idea is repeated.

(6) 806:26: ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη // ἀστέρες τε καὶ ἄστρα μεγάλα . The phrase falls into two distinct parallel units.

(7) 806:31-807:1: διεκρίθη // καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου τόπου διεχωρίσθη . The fact of separation is repeated.

(8) 807:1-2: συνήντησε πάντα ἐν ἀέρι τάδε τοῖσδε // καὶ συνέρραξαν . Meeting and clashing together are probably two terms for the same event.

(9) 807:3-5: πρὸς τὸν πάταγον τῶν βροντῶν . . . ἐγρηγόρησεν // καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἦχον ἐπτύρη The crashing of the thunders awakes the animals and the noise frightens them--another case of repetition.

Hölscher concludes that the text which Philo presents is a

---

p. 214), explains the repetitions and alternatives as "the translator groping for the right word." See Williams, p. 32. Williams is probably dependent on West, *Theogony*, p. 26.

translation of a Phoenician poem, a conclusion which I tentatively share. There is a minor difficulty posed by sentences which lack parallelism, such as 806:19-21. This lack of parallelism, however, partly may be ascribed to the translator,[13] partly may have been original in the Semitic poem.[14]

More serious and important is the problem posed by the alternate explanations. Biblical and Ugaritic parallel stichoi are not commonly true alternatives,[15] they are usually equivalents, complements, or antitheses. Nevertheless, real alternatives are twice found in our text, in examples one and four above. Perhaps here too the translator is responsible; or perhaps Eusebius is responsible. In example one it is particularly probable that Eusebius or the translator misunderstood the parallel phrases as alternate explanation.

The poetic structure leads to one further and highly important hypothesis. Parallelism is used throughout the two sections which Eusebius distinguished as Philo's cosmogony and zoogony, and is not discernible in any other section of the fragments. Therefore in spite of Eusebius' division into two apparently different sections, the entire passage 806:11-807:5 may form a whole derived from one source. The two parts may therefore be used to interpret each other.[16]

---

[13] See Katz, "Septuagintal Studies," p. 202.

[14] If the lapses from strict parallelism came from the original they might be a criterion for dating. See below n. 132.

[15] But they do occur, e.g., Ps. 139:8.

[16] It is of course not impossible that Philo or his source may have used two different Semitic poems about creation; there were presumably many such poems. But the similarity of the two sections makes the supposition of a single source a plausible working hypothesis.

iv

The next section of this chapter should be devoted to a commentary on Philo's cosmogony, in which the text would be analyzed and conclusions concerning the nature and date of its sources drawn. Hölscher and Albright, however, have attempted to answer the latter questions virtually without consideration of the contents, using arguments based mainly or even solely on the poetic form of the cosmogony.[17] It seems simpler to consider their positions before beginning the commentary.

Hölscher, as was mentioned, noticed the poetic form of the cosmogony. His article also epitomizes recent trends in scholarship on the Philonic fragments. Therefore his method and premises in approaching the cosmogony and his conclusions merit careful consideration.

Philo asserts that the Phoenician texts he has translated were very ancient and were indeed Hesiod's sources (813:11-17). Hölscher argues that a comparison of the Hittite Kumarbi epic,[18] and Hesiod's Theogony shows that there was an Urverwandschaft, a primitive affinity, between these works. Philo's "Life of Kronos (809:14-811:20)" shares elements with both the Kumarbi epic and Hesiod.

> Die phönizische Version stimmt mit der hethitischen darin überein, dass vier Göttergenerationen einander ablösen: Eliun, Uranos, El-Kronos, und Demarus. In beiden Reihen trägt der zweite den Namen des Himmels. Die Gleichung El-Kumarbi ist durch einen Ras

---

[17] Hölscher, "Anaximander," p. 395; Albright, YGC, p. 226, n. 46.

[18] Translation of the text in ANET, pp. 120-123.

XUM

> *Schamra Text bestätigt, der diesen Doppelnamen enthält . . . Der Wettergott Demarus gleicht dem hethitischen Wettergott auch darin, dass er der--uneheliche--Sohn des Himmelsgottes ist. Ein wichtiger Unterschied aber: dass er "durch den Willen des Kronos" König wird . . . In übrigen steht Philos Bericht Hesiod näher: Die Rolle der Erde als Anstifterin gegen den Himmel fehlt in Kumarbi Epos; El-Kronos bewaffnet mit der Harpe, entmannt seinen Vater bei Philo wie bei Hesiod aus einem Hinterhalt der Erde; die Blutstropfen fallen in die Gewässer.*[19]

> The Phoenician version agrees with the Hittite in that four generations of gods succeed each other: Eliun, Uranos, El-Kronos, and Demarus. In both series the second person bears the name of the sky. The identification of El and Kumarbi is confirmed by a text from Ras Shamra which contains the double name . . . The weather god Demarus is also like the Hittite weather god in that he is the--illegitimate--son of the sky god. There is however a more important difference. Demarus becomes king "by the will of Kronos." . . . For the rest Philo's account is closer to Hesiod: the role of the earth as the instigator against the sky is lacking in the Kumarbi epic; in Philo as in Hesiod, El-Kronos, armed with a sickle, emasculates his father from an ambush provided by the earth; the drops of blood fall into the waters.

On the basis of this evidence Hölscher concludes that the Philonic "Life of Kronos" stands between the Kumarbi epic and Hesiod's *Theogony*. Philo's assertions about the antiquity of his source must be accepted as true. Sanchuniathon is thus further "rehabilitated."[20]

Turning to the cosmogony, Hölscher proves its poetic form and Phoenician origin and argues that this form and certain similarities between the cosmogony and the first chapter of Genesis prove that the cosmogony was not influenced by Greek thought, "*dass wir es hier mit einer von griechischer Philosophie unbeeinflussten semitischen Kosmogonie zu tun haben*."[21] Therefore in the analysis of the cosmogonic sections

---

[19] Hölscher, "Anaximander," pp. 392-393.

[20] The rehabilitation is based largely on evidence of the type cited in n. 3 above.

[21] Hölscher, "Anaximander," p. 395.

XUM

of Hesiod's Theogony, and particularly of the terms Chaos and Eros, while one ought not conclude that these terms were derived from Philo's sources, one must understand these terms in view of their function in the Philonic cosmogony.[22] One ought to understand the organization of the Theogony: cosmogony followed by succession-myth, similarly.[23] Finally, Ancient Near Eastern cosmological speculation, such as that preserved for us by Philo, prepared the ground for Anaximander.[24]

Hölscher never suggests a precise date for the immediate source of Philo's cosmogony, although he obviously believed that Philo's immediate source antedated Hesiod and Anaximander. Albright, following Hölscher, has recently attempted to date the immediate source more precisely. He argues that the absence of the second millenium repetitive style in the text suggests a date between the tenth and eighth centuries B.C., before Genesis 1-2:3a.[25] Albright, however, does not explain why he believes the immediate source of the cosmogony could not have been written after the eighth century B.C.

To conclude, Hölscher has offered (and Albright has accepted and expanded) two proofs for the antiquity of the source of the cosmogony and its freedom from Greek influence: the demonstrated antiquity of Philo's "Life of Kronos," and the poetic form of the text. These proofs will be analyzed and criticized in the following section.

V

The problem of the relationship between Philo's "Life of Kronos,"

---

[22] Ibid., pp. 397-398. [23] Ibid., pp. 403-4. [24] Ibid., p. 418.

[25] Albright, YGC, p. 226, n. 46.

XUM

the Kumarbi epic, and Hesiod's Theogony will be discussed in detail in the commentary on the relevant passages. For our purposes here it is sufficient to note that the nature and date of the sources of the "Life of Kronos," are probably totally irrelevant to the nature and date of the source of the cosmogony. The cosmogony is the only section of the fragments in which traces of poetic parallelism may be seen, as it is the only section in which kai is used constantly. It is therefore virtually certain that the source of this section must be different than the sources of the other section. Whatever date is assigned to the sources of the "Life of Kronos," proves nothing about the date of the source of the cosmogony.

Hölscher's second proof, that the poetic form necessarily proves the lack of Greek influence is astounding. Although no Phoenician poems have survived, it is indubitable that Phoenician poetry was based on parallelism. Direct evidence for this is to be found in passages of inscriptions where the author waxes poetic. Line 2 of the Ahiram sarcophagus (KAI 1) is a good example. Any future political leader of Byblos who may uncover Ahiram's sarcophagus is cursed: תחתסף חטר משפטה // תהתפך כסא מלכה "let his judicial staff be broken // let his royal throne be upset.[26] The Kilamuwa inscription is another example. Kilamuwa boasts of the "good deal" he made with the king of Assyria who he says (KAI 24,8): עלמת יתן בש // וג̇בר בשלמת "gave a maid for a lamb // a man for a garment."[27] A final example is the Eshmunazar inscription. Any ruler who uncovers Eshmunazar's coffin is cursed that he may not have: שרש למט // פר למעל "no trunk below, // and no fruit up on top.[28] There is also considerable indirect evidence. The Ugaritic epics (considered indirect evidence because of their date and disputed linguistic classification), and Biblical poetry leave no doubt that the Phoenicians wrote their poems in the same manner.

---

[26] The translation is that of Rosenthal in ANET, p. 504. For a discussion of the date of this inscription see KAI ad loc.

[27] The translation is again Rosenthal's, ANET, p. 500. Rosenthal dates the inscription to the second half of the ninth century B.C.

In view of the lack of Phoenician poetry it is impossible to judge Hölscher's contention by reference to Phoenician texts. The considerable remains of the poetry of the neighboring Jews, however, afford an indirect but decisive answer. The Jews employed the parallelistic technique in writing their poetry throughout the Second Commonwealth.[29] The technique was used in poems which were influenced by Greek thought,[30] and in fact, in poems written in Greek.[31] In view of this evidence, Hölscher's argument that the poetic form of the text proves, a priori, that it is free of Greek influence is incredible.

---

[28] Text in KAI 14, lines 11-12. On the translation, particularly on שרש = trunk, see Ginsberg, "Milon," pp. 167-170. Cf. Isaiah 37:31 and Amos 2:9. Another inscription in which the author waxes poetic is the one published by Cross, "Phoenician Incantation," p. 44.

[29] The technique was used in composing many of the poems preserved in the Apocrypha. See I. Macc. 3:1-9 and Judith 9:1-4; 16:1-25. In the Pseudepigrapha see Jubilees 22:11-23 and chapter 46 of Enoch. There are many other passages. On the New Testament see Burney, Poetry, pp. 63-95. The Dead Sea Scrolls are most instructive, particularly as they are preserved in the original language. See DSW XI:13-15; DSD X:16-20; DST V: 20-23.

On the Damascus Document see Rabin, Zadokite Documents, p. x.

[30] Ben Sira 11:35; 13:3; 20:18; 24:3 are good examples. Segal, Ben Sira, pp. 10 & 25, discusses these verses and the general question of Greek influence in the book.

[31] I refer to Wisdom of Solomon. Parallelism is not consistently employed in the book. This has been one basis of the many attempts to divide the work into sources. However, the inability of scholars to establish the boundaries of the sources, when taken together with other evidence for the unity of the book suggests that the book was not

Albright's argument for a date between the tenth and eighth centuries B.C. for the source of Philo's cosmogony is more difficult to evaluate. Albright is certainly correct in noticing the absence of the second millenium repetitive style in the cosmogony and he is probably correct in concluding that the source could not have been written before the tenth century. The difficulty lies in his opinion that it could not have been written after the eighth century, an opinion which, as was noted above, he does not explain. If Albright's date was based on the nature of the poetic style it was a hazardous and injudicious conclusion. The study of Biblical poetic style is not sufficiently advanced to justify precise dates based on the nature of parallelism alone. Moreover, one would be transferring such dates (even if they were certain) from the Israelites to the Phoenicians without having any examples of Phoenician poetry. If Albright's conclusion was based on the similarities to Genesis it was equally hazardous. The date of Gen. 1-2:3 is not beyond doubt,[32] and similarities to Genesis are not sufficient criteria for the dates of the Enuma Elish,

---

composite but that the author gradually wearied and dropped the technique. The original language was probably Greek. We thus possess a document written in Greek in the first half of which the poetic techniques of Biblical literature were employed. Furthermore, the influence of Greek philosophy on Wisdom of Solomon is apparent, as can be seen from a comparison of Wisdom 9:15 and Plato, Phaedo 81C.

Concerning these points on Wisdom of Solomon see Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1, pp. 521-524 and 532. Pfeiffer, NT Times, pp. 319-321 and 331; Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 600-603.

[32] For two widely differing dates of Genesis 1-2:3 and of the P traditions of which it is a part see Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 207-208, and Kaufmann, Religion, pp. 175-200.

the Book of Jubilees, or Corpus Hermeticum III to mention three obvious examples.

In conclusion, the analysis of the form and style of Philo's cosmogony indicates its ultimate Phoenician source and suggests a date after the second millenium B.C., but does not suggest a more precise date for the more proximate source. The precise date cannot be determined from form and style alone, but must depend on analysis of the contents. A fresh start therefore will be made in the following commentary.

vi

This commentary has several purposes in addition to the obvious task of explaining the translation above. Every cosmogony has what could be called an agenda, a list of phenomena whose origins the cosmogony will describe. These agendas are sometimes quite limited; not every cosmogony attempts the comprehensiveness of Genesis 1. The Egyptians of Hermopolis, for example, were unconcerned about the origins of celestial bodies (other than the sun), vegetation, animal or human life.[33]

It is impossible to be certain of the agenda of Philo's cosmogony since only the excerpts quoted by Eusebius have survived, but some judgment can be made on the basis of these extracts. The agenda included explanations of the origins of male and female animal life. It may also have accounted for celestial bodies, such as the sun, moon, and stars. The decision whether or not it did so depends on the interpretation of two key passages, and on the exact relationship between

---

[33] See Brandon, Creation Legends, pp. 23, 55-56.

Mōt, the egg, and the celestial bodies (806:23-26).

Another question which must be considered is that of the nature and date of the source of the cosmogony. This question will be particularly difficult to answer since we know so little about the cosmogonic notions of the Phoenicians. There are a few sparse hints in the Ugaritic epics, a huge chronological gap, a few hints in early Phoenician inscriptions, another huge chronological gap, and then the cosmogonies preserved by Greek authors and Philo of Byblos. This lack of Phoenician comparative material necessitates a heavy reliance on non-Phoenician parallels.

Several lines of analysis have already suggested that Philo's ultimate source was Near Eastern, specifically Phoenician. We must now ask whether parallels confirm this suggestion, and must also attempt to determine the nature and date of the more proximate source of the cosmogony. The first step is to see what in the cosmogony can or cannot be accounted for in Near Eastern terms. Only Near Eastern parallels will therefore be cited in this section of the commentary; those directly relevant will be discussed in the text, those more general will be mentioned in the notes.

806:15 archēn

Bunsen proposed the sense adopted - beginning - his word was "origin."[34] The word cannot mean first principle in this sentence since archēn is singular, while two things, aēr and chaos follow. The sense in which aēr and chaos were considered the origin of things will be discussed below on 806:17.

---

[34] Bunsen Vol. 5, p. 807, n. 1.

XUM

806:15 *hypotithetai*.

This word indicates that the original sentence has been paraphrased. Presumably it has also been abridged. Abridgement would explain the schematic presentation of the cosmogonic process, which makes it impossible for us to be certain about the complete agenda of the original. It is more likely that Eusebius is paraphrasing Philo rather than Philo paraphrasing his alleged source Sanchuniathon. Eusebius often abridges his sources.[35] Direct citation begins (as it commonly does in Eusebius)[36] with *phēsi* in line 17.

806:15 *aera zophōdē*.

Literally this phrase means "dark air." It could also mean "dark cloud," based on the equivalence of *aēr* and שחק in the Septuagint.[37] My translation is based, first of all, on the obvious fact that air is dark when misty or cloudy. Moreover, ζόφον ἠεροέντα, meaning "dark mist," is a set phrase in the Iliad.[38] Such a usage continued later and is attested for Chrysippus who spoke of ἀέρα ζοφερόν, misty air.[39]

806:16 *Chaos*.

According to LSJ s.v., *chaos* can mean either infinite space, unformed matter, unformed water, the nether abyss, or a chasm. I have chosen the translation "watery *chaos*," thus making Philo's "turbid *chaos*,

---

[35] See the use of D.S. in Book 2 of the *P.E.* and the notes in Mras, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Vol. 1, pp. 58-78.

[36] See *P.E.* 1,9,12; 2,2,52; 2,6,8.

[37] Ps. 18:12=17:12(LXX).

[38] Homer, *Il*. 12,240; 15,191; 23,51; Cf. 21,56.

[39] SVF, Vol. 2, frag. 429.

XUM

dark as Erebos," the equivalent of the Tehom covered by darkness in Gen. 1:2.[40]

The origin of all things from water in Philo's cosmogony is confirmed by one of the few hints on cosmogonic matters we possess from the Ugaritic epics and Phoenician inscriptions. El, in the Ugaritic epics, lives at the sources of Tehom. The standard description of a journey to El is:

> ttn pnm 'm il mbk nhrm
> qrb apq thmtm.
>
> There she is off on her way
> towards El of the Sources of the Two Floods
> in the midst of the headwaters of the two oceans.[41]

El is also a creator god in the Ugaritic epics. He is called ab adm - "Father of Man,"[42] and bny bnwt - the "Creator of Creatures."[43] In the Azitawada inscription El is qn 'rṣ - the "Creator of the Earth."[44] El, who lived at the sources of thmtm was a creator god. This is in essential agreement with Philo's cosmogony which states that the origin of all things was a watery chaos, but considerable demythologizing--not at all characteristic of the Near East[45]--has intervened between Ugarit,

---

[40] Cf. Apsu and Tiamat of the Enuma Elish and Berossus frag. 12 (Schnabel).

[41] Gordon, UT, 51:IV:20-22; Translation: ANET, p. 133. See also Ezechiel 28:2. Cf. Pope, El, pp. 102-103.

[42] Gordon, UT, Krt:37.

[43] Ibid., II Aqht:I:25.

[44] KAI 26 A III,18. This title is obviously behind the formula in Gen. 14:19.

[45] See Frankfort, BP, pp. 253-254. Eissfeldt, RS, p. 84 noticed the absence of the traditional gods in the cosmogony. In his "Kosmogonie," he makes the cosmogony a source and inspiration for Greek

Azitawada, and Philo's cosmogony. The personality of the god El has been replaced by the physical element with which he was associated. The demythologizing, however, is not complete; the elements still behave as if they were deities: the pneuma "desires" its own primary elements as the deities in the earlier myths were enamored of their own parents or children. Similarly, Pothos--or the wind--is "ignorant" of his own origins.

The chaos of the cosmogony is "dark as Erebos." Once again, Gen. 1:2 is significant, as are the Egyptian traditions of Hermopolis. These traditions speak of four pairs of deities united in an ogdoad. Each of these pairs represented a physical fact. The first pair represented the initial waters, the third pair darkness.[46]

806:16 apeira.

The aēr and chaos were boundless, in extent rather than in time.[47] The Greek word makes one think of Anaximander, but the concept can be explained in Near Eastern terms. The earth in Gen. 1:2 was

---

rationalism. Albright, YGC, p. 259 does likewise. The true relationship is the reverse and the arguments developed below in discussing the history of scientific meteorology are equally relevant. That the cosmogony demythologized the accounts of the traditional gods may seem odd since Philo opposed those who made the stories about the gods into physical accounts (805:6, 813:5-6). Perhaps Philo was not aware that the cosmogony he presented was doing exactly what he rejected. He may have understood the text in purely scientific terms and may not have recognized its mythological background. In any case, such demythologizing was an important stage in the passage of the Greeks from a mythical to a rational mentality. See Guthrie, ITB, pp. 11-19.

[46] NDM, p. 53; Brandon, Creation Legends, p. 46.

[47] Duri dari of Mesopotamian cosmogony is boundless time and therefore not strictly comparable. See Lambert & Walcot, "Babylonian Theogony," p. 70.

תהו ובהו, a difficult phrase which has long puzzled commentators.[48] Formlessness of some sort is implied by the context. This would not be an exact equivalent of Philo's *apeira* but formlessness and boundlessness are related concepts. A closer parallel is offered by the Hermopolitan traditions mentioned above. The second of the four pairs are Huh and Hauhet who stand for spatial infinity.[49]

806:17 *Pneuma*.

According to Bernays, this *pneuma* is not to be identified with the *aēr pneumatōdē* or *pnoē* of 806:15, since this *pneuma* can desire its own *archai* while the latter is called *archēn tōn holōn* and seemingly has no *archai*.[50] Appreciation of the difference between the meaning of *archēn* (beginning) in 806:15 and *archōn* (primary elements) in 806:18 may remove the difficulty which Bernays noticed, and restore the obvious equivalence of the *pneuma* and the *aēr pneumatōdē* or *pnoē*.

In 806:18 *archōn* means the sources or constituent elements of the *pneuma*. If one may judge from the depiction of the production of *pneumata* in 806:30, these sources would be the land and water within the watery chaos.[51] In 806:15 *archēn* means the beginning of all things, the בראשית of the world. Like the first two verses of Genesis, 806:15 describes the state of the world at the point at which the author chose to commence his narrative.[52] The author has omitted all the events which precede that point, in our case the production of the aēr zōphōdē kai pneumatōdē from the land and water of the chaos. We would not know of these prior events save for the need to describe the "love" of the pneuma for its own archai.

---

[48] See e.g. Cassuto, *Adam*, pp. 11-12.

[49] Brandon, *Creation Legends*, p. 46.

[50] Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 808, n. 2.

[51] The use of the production of the *pneumata* of 806:30 to interpret the *archai* of the *pneuma* of 806:17 is based on the hypothecated unity of the cosmogony and zoogony, discussed above.

[52] On Genesis, see Speiser, *Genesis*, pp. 8-13.

If one combines these considerations, the scheme of the cosmogony emerges as follows: (1) the land and water within the dark and turbid watery chaos; (2) the production of the aēr=pnoē=pneuma from the chaos; (3) the desire of that pneuma for its own sources and the resultant mixture called Pothos.[53]

Hermopolis, again, is even more significant than Gen. 1:2. The Hermopolitan ogdoad must somehow include the land (like Philo's chaos) since it produces the hillock on which the subsequent acts of the cosmogony take place.[54] Most important of all, the fourth pair of the ogdoad, Amun and Amaunet, stand for the wind.[55] The four Hermopolitan pairs, taken as a whole, are the precise equivalent of the beginning of Philo's cosmogony. They stand for dark infinite waters, stirred by wind as the active agent, as in Philo.[56]

---

[53] This interpretation is based on the equation of the sygkrasis and the plokē. The equation is justified because the two words are in parallelism to each other. Professor Smith has called my attention to the oddity that the mixture of pneuma and its sources is called Pothos, rather than the desire for such a mixture.

[54] NDM, p. 35; Brandon, Creation Legends, pp. 45-46.

[55] Sethe, Amun, pp. 90ff.

[56] Brandon, Creation Legends, pp. 46-47. Cf. Maspero ap. Clemen, p. 35. Less directly relevant to Philo is the beginning of the Enuma Elish which describes the intermingling of Apsu, Tiamat, and Mummu, of the two kinds of waters and the mist or clouds, on which see Jacobsen in Frankfort, BP, p. 184. The cosmogony of Mochos, FGrH 784 F 4, is also indirectly relevant, as the roles of the winds differ.

XUM

806:19 *Pothos*.

Pothos, as has been shown, is a combination of land, water, and wind. Figures similar to Pothos are not found in Near Eastern cosmogonies, with the exception of the cosmogony of the Sidonians preserved by Eudemus (in Damascius).[57] This cosmogony is quite similar to Philo's as it begins with ὀμίχλη, "mist" and *Pothos*.[58] These two produce *aēr* and *aura*, and from here Damascius (who is reporting Eudemus) goes off into Neo-Platonic speculation. Pothos' appearance in this Sidonian cosmogony can be interpreted in two ways: it either means that such a figure was a traditional part of Phoenician cosmogony (and thus not suggested by Hesiod's *Eros*), or it can mean that both the Sidonian cosmogony and Philo's were borrowing from Greek sources. In the latter case the borrowing must have begun by 350 B.C., since Eudemus worked in the second half of the fourth century.

806:19 *auto*

This is the reading of the MSS. If correct it must refer to the *pneuma* of line 17, since that is the only useful neuter noun in the preceding phrases. If so the sentence would state either that the wind did not know of the creation of Pothos or of its own creation (i.e. origin), depending on whether one accepts the *autou* of the MSS. or emends to *hautou* (on which see below).

---

[57] *FGrH* 784 F 4. Pothos is responsible for one of the illuminative stupidities in the history of Philonic scholarship. Halevy, excited by the recent discovery of the Enuma Elish, assumed that it was the key to unlocking the enigmas in Philo. He therefore proposed understanding Pothos as a translation of Hebrew חפץ, which in turn had entered the text as an incorrect transliteration of Apsu. From our vantage point, almost a century after Halevy, this is ridiculous. How will the Ugaritic keys look a century from now? See Halevy, "Pothos et Mot," p. 386.

[58] *FGrH* 784 F 4. In this case the desire is called Pothos. Cf. n. 53.

The context here, however, seems to indicate a reference to Pothos who has just been produced and declared the source of all subsequent creation. He should therefore now go on to create but will do so incestuously. His incest must be excused by ignorance.[59] Accordingly read autos instead of auto.

806:20 hautou.

This is Eissfeldt's emendation,[60] the MSS. read autou.[61] Since we have emended auto to autos above, Eissfeldt's emendation is also necessary. Only if Pothos was unaware of his own creation (i.e. origins) will the sentence make sense.

806:21 Mōt.

Mōt is produced by the union of Pothos and the wind (taking tou pneumatos of 806:20 twice). Mōt is thus the offspring of a second case of incest. In physical terms, Pothos was a mixture of chaos (land and water) and wind. Pothos' union with the wind adds more pneuma to the mixture, which was now called Mōt. This agrees with the description of Mōt in 806:21-22 as either mud or the putrefaction of a watery mixture.

Philo's Mōt has been an enigma to generations of scholars,[62] as he seemingly appeared nowhere but in Philo.[63] Even the Ugaritic god Mot seemed irrelevant as he was the god of death, whose voracious appetite (49:II:21) inspired Isa. 5:14, and who appeared with his proper functions in 812:9-11 as *Mouth*.[64] Pope, in his commentary on Job, has the merit of finally resolving this enigma. The Ugaritic god is lord of the underworld. His domain is described in a difficult passage of the epics (51:VIII:1ff.) as filthy, slushy, and putrescent. As Pope notes, this is a perfect equivalent of Philo's description of *Mōt* as mud, or the putrefaction of a watery mixture.[65]

---

[59] Cp. Lot in Genesis. The incest which must be excused is that of Pothos with the winds rather than the prior case of incest of the wind with its own archai which produced Pothos. The first case of incest was presented without apology so there is no need now to go back and apologize for it.

[60] See the critical apparatus ad loc. in Mras, Praeparatio Evangelica.

[61] Ibid.

[62] See Orelli, p. 10, n. 4 and Cook, Zeus, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 1038.

[63] Cook was tempted to introduce Mōt into the cosmogony of the

Pope's interpretation is significant for several reasons. The Ugaritic god now appears twice in Philo, once, in the cosmogony as *Mōt*, and again as *Mouth*. This difference of vocalization further supports the arguments presented above for concluding that the cosmogony comes from a different source than the rest of the fragments. Even more significant, however, is the gap between the Ugaritic epics and Philo implicit in Pope's interpretation.[66] *Mōt* of the cosmogony has none of the functions of his Ugaritic equivalent. The name of the Ugaritic god has been used by Philo's source to stand for the physical description of that god's residence, as a name for mud. As in the case of El, above, considerable demythologizing has intervened between the cosmogony and Ugarit.

Ugaritic Mot does not seem to have any cosmogonic functions in

---

Sidonians by emending Ὦτος in that text to Μῶτον our *Mōt*. See Cook, *Zeus*, Vol. 2, Part 2, pp. 1036-1037.

[64] Cf. Dussaud, *Découvertes*, p. 70.

[65] Pope, *Job*, pp. 73-74. Cf. Ginsberg, *ANET*, p. 134.

[66] Pope did not see these implications and sees the Ugaritic passage as further evidence "rehabilitating" Philo's claims.

the known texts. Mud, however, does have cosmogonic functions in other Near Eastern traditions. In Babylonia, Lahmu and Lahamu, who represent silt, are the first offspring of the intermingling of Apsu, Tiamat and Mummu.[67] All the Egyptian traditions, including that of Hermopolis, agree that the emergence of the primeval hillock from the waters of the Noun is the first stage of the creation of the world.[68] The notion of animal life arising from mud looks suspicious, as this was a theory of Greek science.[69] More suspicious is the fact that putrefaction and mud as the material of spontaneous generation were alternative Greek theories, just as in Philo.[70] However the experience of seeing life seemingly spontaneously emerge from the mud was common, particularly in Egypt.[71]

806:23 ēn.

What is the subject of ēn, Mōt or zōia? If Mōt is the subject he is identified with the insensate animals. If Mōt is not the subject the discussion of the animals (both insensate and intellectual) is a new point, of which the connection with Mōt is not indicated explicitly. The context indicates that the latter alternative is preferable. Mōt is a putrefaction or mud. Mud or putrefactions often were believed to produce life spontaneously, as was mentioned above. Mōt should therefore not be identified with the zōia. The zōia are the subject of ēn, and the reader was expected to understand that they arose from Mōt.

---

[67] See note 56 and Jacobsen in Frankfort, BP, p. 185. Mud in the Enuma Elish is produced in a manner analogous to that of the cosmogony. Cf. Williams, p. 37 who sees "little or no similarity between Sanchuniathon's cosmogony and the Akkadian account of creation."

[68] NDM, pp. 71-72 and text 29.

[69] See Guthrie, ITB, pp. 29-45.

[70] Ibid.

[71] See Wilson, in Frankfort, BP, pp. 59-60.

XUM

806:23-24 aisthēsin, noera.

Although the usual translations for these words are used, "sensate" and "intellectual," the usual meanings are somewhat difficult. Plato established the distinction between the sensible and intellectual realms and this contrast guided usage.[72] Yet this distinction is not behind the statement that there were animals which had no aisthēsis from which there arose animals which were noera. If the usual contrast were intended, the text should state that there were sensate animals from which there arose intellectual animals, or that there were insensate animals from which there arose sensate animals. Finally, the living beings characterized as intellectual are called "watchers of heaven;" their capacity is seemingly sensory.

806:24 eklethē - Zophasēmin.

The Zophasemin are the intellectual animals, somehow connected with the origin of male and female animal life (807:3-5). Philo translates the word as ouranou katoptai. The Greek translation indicates that in spite of the fact that Greek Zeta is not the usual transliteration for Hebrew and Phoenician ṣ,[73] and in spite of the possible inaccuracy of the vocalization preserved by the MSS.,[74] Zophasēmin must be a transliteration of צופי שמים . Both צופי שמים and ouranou katoptai are ambiguous: they can either mean observers of heaven (on earth), or heavenly observers (in heaven). Are Philo's Zophasēmin on earth looking up, or in heaven looking down? Certainty is impossible, but I believe that the Zophasēmin of the cosmogony (as it stands) were on earth. The stars and planets, with which the Zophasemin would be somehow associated if they were in heaven, are not brought into existence until after the mention of the *Zophasēmin* (806:26). This, however, does not exclude the possibility that in some earlier version of the cosmogony the *Zophasēmin* were in heaven (see below).

---

[72] See LSJ s.v. aisthētos.

[73] Movers, Vol. 1, p. 135. [74] Clemen, p. 19.

Figures with names similar to that of the *Zophasēmin* appear in the Jewish legends of the fallen angels, particularly as found in the Book of Enoch. One of the names for the fallen angels is the ἐγρήγοροι, the "watchers;" or in fuller form, the ἐγρήγοροι τῆς οὐρανοῦ, which can be translated the "watchers of heaven,"[75] though it strictly means the "wakeful ones of heaven," and its Hebrew equivalent is not צופי but עירי.[76] Nevertheless the similarity of the names may not be accidental; for as Spiegel has shown, the Jewish legends of the fallen angels contain much debased Canaanite mythology.[77] There could have been some gods of Canaanite mythology called "watchers" or "wakeful ones of heaven." As the fallen angels were often associated with the planetary angels these Canaanite gods might have been associated with the planets. Jewish legend made these gods angels, but Philo's cosmogony, in its typical fashion made them animals, perhaps on earth (as opposed to the gods' original location in heaven).[78]

---

[75] Enoch 1:5 and 12:4. The "Watchers" in Enoch can also be the Archangels or good angels.

[76] See Dan. 4:10 LXX (TH.)

[77] Spiegel, "NDJ," pp. 337-355.

[78] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 57 also realized that the *Zophasēmin* must have originally been gods, but he did not see the connection with the Jewish legends. On the fallen angels as planetary angels see Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 52-54.

806:25 *aneplasthē*.

The discussion of the various kinds of animals intervenes between the mention of *Mōt* in 806:21 and 806:26. The subject of *aneplasthē* is therefore not clear. If *Mōt* is to be identified with the צופי שמים there is no problem. If he is not, the subject may be either *Mōt* or the צופי שמים , or both. If as suggested above, *Mōt* is conceived as the mass of putrefaction from which the insensate and intellectual animals emerge, both *Mōt* and the animals can be the subjects.[79]

The cosmogonic traditions of Hermopolis, which agree almost exactly with the beginning of Philo's cosmogony, strongly suggest that *Mōt* must somehow be at least one of the subjects of the verb, that is must be part of the egg-shaped whole. The next sentence in the cosmogony mentions *Mōt*, the sun, moon, stars, and great luminous bodies. As will become clearer in the commentary on that sentence, the only philologically feasible interpretations of the relationship between *Mōt* and these heavenly bodies all connect *Mōt* with their emergence, or origin. Now the traditions of Hermopolis speak of the birth of the solar demiurge from an egg.[80] Since the cosmogonies of Hermopolis and Philo are so close to each other, it seems reasonable to make *Mōt* one of the subjects of *aneplasthē*, part of the "*Lichtei*," or egg from which the heavenly luminaries are born.[81]

---

[79] Williams, p. 82 makes the *Zophasēmin* alone egg-shaped. Cf. Ewald, p. 37 and Bunsen Vol. 5, p. 810, n. 3 who reorganized the text to make *Mōt* the subject of the verb.

[80] *NDM*, p. 61, texts 19 & 20. Brandon, *Creation Legends*, pp. 44-45.

[81] The term *Lichtei* was suggested by Lukas in his "Das Ei," pp. 231-233 as part of an attempt to distinguish the various aspects

806:26 *exelampse - megala*.

This sentence, which reads like Greek poetry,[82] is also one of the most crucial and enigmatic for the meaning of the cosmogony. *Mōt*, which is indeclinable, could be, as far as form goes, either the subject or object of the verb. However, since *eklampō* can only take as cognate accusative,[83] (as in the sentence ὁ πατὴρ ἐξέλαμψε τὸν υἱὸν . . . ὥσπερ . . . ὁ ἥλιος τὸ . . . ἀπαύγασμα, "the father shone forth the son . . . like the sun . . . its rays),[84] *Mōt* cannot here be the object, nor would it make sense as a cognate accusative. Therefore it must be, together with the heavenly bodies, one of the multiple subjects of the verb.[85] The emphasis is on the first of the subjects, on *Mōt*, and the sentence should be translated, "And *Mōt* shone forth together with the sun and moon, the stars and the great luminous bodies."[86] The agenda now includes the origin of the heavenly luminaries.

This meaning, however, is not very satisfying, particularly in view of the Egyptian texts cited above which suggest that the sun should be born from the egg-shaped *Mōt*. Accordingly an attractive emendation of this passage was suggested by Ewald:[87] ἐξέλαμψεν ἐκ τοῦ Μῶτ . . . ,

---

of the egg in ancient and modern cosmogonies. The egg in the cosmogony of Mochos, *FGrH* 784 F 4, is a *Weltei* in Lukas' terminology: heaven and earth result when it splits. Cf. Eliade, *ap. NDM*, p. 480.

[82] The meter seems to be [-]⏑ - ⏑ - ⏑ - // - ⏑ - ⏑ - ⏑ - ⏑ // - ⏑ - ⏑ ⏑ - ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ . The translator of the Phoenician poem seems to have rendered it as Greek poetry.

[83] See LSJ s.v. [84] Cyr. *Thes*. 6 (5^1. 47A).

[85] On multiple subjects of a singular verb see Moulton & Turner, *NT Greek*, Vol. 3, pp. 313-314.

[86] Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," col. 1495 adopts this translation.

[87] Ewald, p. 37. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 56 translates as if he made the same emendation, but says nothing of making it.

XUM

the sun and moon burst forth into light from *Mōt*.

Another emendation can be suggested which does less violence to the text. The verb *eklampō* can be used with a cognate accusative, as was mentioned above. The sun and other celestial luminaries can be cognate accusatives of the verb and all that is necessary to make them accusatives is to change the case endings of *hēlios* and *selēnē*.[88] The sentence should than be translated, "And Mot blazed forth the sun and the moon, the stars and the great luminous bodies." This emendation retains the connection between *Mōt* and the heavenly bodies suggested by the Hermopolitan traditions. It is also easy to explain how the error entered the MSS. traditions; case endings were often abbreviated in ancient and medieval MSS and could thus be readily confused.[89] I have adopted the emendation to accusatives for all these reasons.

Since the Ugaritic god Mot was so useful for solving the enigmatic description of *Mōt* as mud or the putrefaction of a watery mixture in 806:21-2, it may seem odd that no appeal to Ugarit has been made to solve the problem of *Mōt*'s relationship to the sun and moon. There is one Ugaritic stock expression which connects the Ugaritic god of death with the sun. It appears as follows in 51:VIII:20ff.

nrt ilm špš	Even the god's Torch
ṣḥrrt la	Shapash, who wings
šmm byd md	over heaven's expanse
d ilm mt.	is in Mot, El's beloved's hand.[90]

---

[88] In the context of his own reorganization of the text Bernays, *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 810, n. 4. proposed the emendation to accusatives.

[89] See Devreese, *Manuscrites Grecs*, pp. 36-46.

[90] Cf. Gordon, *UT*, 49:II:23ff. where the same phrase appears. The translation is Ginsberg's *ANET*, p. 135. Ginsberg is uncertain of the rendering of the phrase "who wings over heaven's expanse."

XUM

Ugaritic Mot and the sun seem to be enemies, with the sun being Baal's ally against Mot. The relationship between Ugaritic Mot and the sun is therefore quite different than between the cosmogony's Mōt and the sun. This may be another indication of the gap between Ugarit and the cosmogony, although the gap here may not be chronological but due to the cosmogony's having followed some non-Ugaritic source.

806:29 aeros

In the set phrase aēr zophōdēs of 806:15, aēr was rendered as "mist." The usual post-Hesiodic meaning is preferable here--air.

806:28-807:3 kai - astrapai

Meteorological phenomena are explained in these sentences in "scientific" terms, that is as natural processes. Rain results when water, evaporated by the sun from the land and sea, condenses in the clouds and falls back to earth. Thunder occurs when the waters evaporated from the earth meet each other again in the air (presumably as clouds) and crash. It is difficult to account for these explanations of rain and thunder in Near Eastern terms. The Babylonians did not explain meteorological phenomena scientifically.[91] When Baal goes to the netherworld in the Ugaritic epics he takes the rains with him.[92] Nevertheless, Albright has hinted that scientific meteorology was discovered by Phoenicians,[93] and Eissfeldt has made similar suggestions.[94]

---

[91] See Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien, Vol. 2, p. 65 and pp. 381-382. For Egypt see Wilson, in Frankfort, BP, p. 90.

[92] See Gordon, UT, 67:V:6ff.

[93] Albright, YGC, p. 259.

[94] Eissfeldt, "Kosmogonie," p. 3 and pp. 13-14. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 57 noticed the scientific meteorology, but he neither discussed it nor used it as a criterion for dating.

XUM

Albright and Eissfeldt's suggestions are difficult to evaluate as neither has fully developed his position. Near Eastern sources, however, seem either silent or hostile to their contention, and their best proof would come from the cosmogony itself which both consider free of Greek influence because of its poetic form. The arguments from the poetic style, however, have been disproven above, and a glance at the Old Testament illustrates the weakness of Albright and Eissfeldt's position. Several Biblical passages speak of meteorological phenomena, such as Ps. 77:17 ff., or Jer. 10:13. In all of these YHWH is directly responsible for sending rain or thunder. It might seem that Isa. 55:10 reflects scientific meteorology, but evaporation--the crucial ingredient in understanding rainfall as a natural process--is not mentioned, and the imagery would be meaningless if YHWH did not control the rains.[95]

If scientific meteorology originated in the Near East it is also odd that these theories appear so late and so casually in post-

---

[95] The verse does reflect the common notion that the water which falls from heaven must get there somehow; but the verse does not specify evaporation as the process. Kimchi's comments on this verse, in which he adds his father's opinion that the process is evaporation, confirm this interpretation.

Professor Smith suggested a totally different interpretation of the verse, equally damaging to the notion that it implies rational meteorology. He proposes that ושמה לא ישוב means that the waters never return on high at all. Presumably the rain comes from the inexhaustible waters above the firmament.

Whatever the case, it is clear that the prophet conceived of YHWH as controlling rainfall. The rain is YHWH's messenger as the image makes apparent. See Isa. 45:6-8 and McKenzie, Second Isaiah, p. 144.

Rational meteorology may be implied in Eccl. 11:3, but this can only harm Albright and Eissfeldt's case in view of the accepted opinions as to the date and nature of Ecclesiastices, on which see Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 494-496.

Biblical Jewish sources. The first instance of such scientific explanation is in TB Berachot 59a. Four explanations are given for thunder,[96] in the names of scholars of whom the earliest, Samuel (and possibly Rab),[97] lived about a century after Philo. It would thus appear that "scientific" meteorology reached the Jews only after it had become a commonplace among the Greeks,[98] which would be odd if it had been discovered first by people of the Near East, and particularly by Phoenicians.

To conclude, the "scientific" meteorology of Philo's cosmogony cannot be explained in Ancient Near Eastern terms. It joins the rationalizing or demythologizing tendency on the list of aspects of the cosmogony inexplicable in terms of the Ancient Near East.

807:5 ekinēthē - thēlu

After all the lightning and thunder something important should happen. The intellectual animals, having been awakened and frightened, should do something befitting the noisy and terrifying overture. When the text says that "there moved, on land and sea male and female" it implies that the important result was the appearance of sexually differentiated creatures.

---

[96] The context is a discussion of phenomena for which one should pronounce a blessing. Only thunder is explained rationally. The explanations offered are: (1) clouds in a whirl; (2) clouds pouring water into each other; (3) lightning, hitting a cloud and breaking off pieces of hail; (4) the clouds are like open-mouthed jars. When the wind blows across the openings the noise is thunder. It would be interesting to trace the history and origin of these theories. I strongly suspect that investigation would show that these theories were learned from the Greeks.

[97] The printed editions of the Talmud read "the Rabbis." The MS. reads "Rab." Rab is certainly a possible reading, and if the original was Rab it is easy to see how it became corrupted (רב > רבנן). The only difficulty in reading Rab is that when Rab and Samuel disagree Rab is usually mentioned first, but this passage may be one of the exceptions to this rule. For the reading of the MS. and of the printed versions of the text see Rabbinowicz, Dikdukei Sofrim, Vol. 1, p. 334.

[98] See notes 107, 110-112 and Nonnus, Dion. 2, 496-507.

How the intellectual animals produced or were responsible for the appearance of male and female is never explicitly stated. Perhaps the *Zophasēmin* gave birth to these new forms of life as a result of fright; childbirth as a result of fright is a common idea, among the Greeks at least.[99] Another possibility is that the *Zophasēmin* were bisexual and split when they were awakened and scared. Bisexual beings, although never in quite the same role, appear in Near Eastern cosmogonies.[100] A final explanation involves the possibility that the *Zophasēmin* may have originally been planetary gods, as was discussed above. Perhaps the planetary gods of Canaanite mythology had some role in creating animal or human life. The planetary *angels* or governors are creators of life in several later near eastern traditions.[101] If this explanation is correct perhaps Philo's text would be clearer if one read ἐκινήθη καὶ ἐκτίσθη, rather than ἐκινήθη.

The origin of animal life in the cosmogony thus occurs in several stages. Some animals existed before the sun and moon blazed forth; others appeared afterwards. This order disturbed Bunsen who proposed moving the first stages of animal life after the account of the origin of the sun and moon.[102] Schwabl, however, correctly saw that the text should not be reorganized, as the comparison with Genesis 1 (where the heavenly luminaries are created after the plants) indicates.[103]

---

[99] See e.g. Hippocrates, *Mul.* 1,25 (Vol. 8, p. 66 Littré).

[100] See *NDM*, pp. 66-67 and Ebeling, *Tod und Leben*, p. 28.

[101] See Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 9-58. See also *C.H.* I, 11. The origin of the notion of creation by angels, especially planetary angels, remains one of the perplexing problems in the study of Gnosticism. See Grant, "Etres Intermédiaires," pp. 147-154; Danielou, "Mauvais Gouvernement," pp. 454-456; Pétrement, "Sept Archontes," pp. 469-486. See also below n. 118 for the possibility that the Gnostic notion (and that in Philo's cosmogony if it was ever truly there) may be derived from Plato.

807:7 Taautou.

This reference to the works of Taautos=Thoth is particularly interesting in view of the numerous similarities between the cosmogony and the traditions of Hermopolis, the Egyptian city where Thoth was worshiped. Albright, the first to notice these similarities, is certainly correct in supposing that the cosmogony is somehow directly dependent on Hermopolis.[104] Such a direct dependence is reasonable, given the extensive history of contact between Phoenicia (Byblos in particular) and Egypt.[105]

The results of the analysis of the cosmogony may be summarized as follows. The ultimate source was Near Eastern and Phoenician, as was suggested by the poetic form. Much of the cosmogony can be explained in Near Eastern terms, yet two aspects are definitely inexplicable in those terms and two other aspects are troubling.

Inexplicable is the "atheism" of the cosmogony (to use Eusebius' term,) the absence of the traditional gods, or what I have called the

---

[102] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 810, n. 3.

[103] Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," col. 1496, n. *.

[104] Albright, YGC, p. 225. Movers, Vol. 1, p. 136 also proposed deriving the cosmogony from Egyptian traditions. Movers suggestion should not however be considered a forerunner of Albright's as it was based on different, less valid, evidence.

[105] It should be noted that the similarities to Hermopolitan traditions are no criterion for dating the cosmogony as these traditions were quite long-lived. The Hermopolitan texts cited above, notes 46, 54, 68 and 80 are largely of Ptolemaic date.

XUM

demythologizing tendency:[106] the traditional gods have been replaced by the physical element associated with them. That they have been replaced is proved by the fact that the elements now in their places behave--love, are ignorant--like gods. Also inexplicable is the scientific meteorology.

Two other aspects of the cosmogony, while not inexplicable in Near Eastern terms, are nonetheless troubling and suspicious in those terms. Pothos, as we have seen, is quite unusual as a cosmogonic figure, yet a Sidonian cosmogony dated before 350 B.C. also contains a Pothos. The origins of life are alternatively found in mud or putrefaction. This looks suspiciously Greek, yet the experience of seeing life emerge "spontaneously" from the mud was common in Egypt.

A complete explanation of the nature and date of the source of Philo's cosmogony must explain what was inexplicable and what was troubling in Near Eastern terms. To accomplish this task, we must turn away from the Near East and look elsewhere.

vii

Scientific meteorology is first known among the Ionians. It seems probable that this way of explaining the phenomena was originated by Anaximander in the sixth century B.C.[107] It is certain that the conflict between scientific meteorology and traditional religious beliefs is attested only in Greece.[108] The Ionians also began rational cosmogony

---

[106] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 56-57 calls this characteristic the cosmogony's materialism or Aristotelian manner. He does not, however, see the implications for dating. See n. 45.

[107] See K & R, p. 138.

[108] Examples of this conflict would be the prosecution of Anaxagoras

XUM

from which the traditional gods were absent.[109] Greek science can therefore account for the two inexplicable aspects of Philo's cosmogony.

Anaximander's description of rainfall has been preserved only by Hippolytus. The MSS. of Hippolytus are all corrupt. Accepting Kahn's emendation Anaximander said: "Rainfall arises from the vapor emitted by the earth under the action of the sun."[110] That is, the sun raises vapors from the lower regions and these vapors condense in the clouds and fall back to the earth as rain. The explanation of rainfall in the cosmogony clearly agrees with Anaximander's.

The cosmogony's account of the production of thunder also has parallels in Greek natural philosophy. Zeno, according to Diogenes Laertius, explained thunder as arising from the rubbing of the clouds.[111] Lucretius offers an explanation which agrees precisely with the cosmogony's.[112] Philo's cosmogony therefore agrees not only in approach but also in detail with Greek science.

Greek cosmogony may also have been responsible for the two troublesome aspects of the cosmogony. Figures like Pothos may have been traditional among the Phoenicians, but *Eros* in Hesiod and Aris-

---

(even though it is not certain exactly why and when he was prosecuted), and the new-fangled notions of Socrates in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, esp. lines 364-426; 816-830. I confess to being puzzled why the reaction to scientific meteorology did not occur until over a century after these ideas were first proposed.

[109] See Jaeger, *Theology*, pp. 22-37.

[110] ὑετοὺς δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀτμίδος τῆς ἐκ γῆς ὑφ' ἡλίου ἀναδιδομένης. Kahn, *Anaximander*, pp. 63-64.

[111] D.L. 7, 154 = SVF 1, frag. 117.

[112] Lucretius 6,96-98: *concurrunt subline volantes / aetheriae nubes*.

XUM

tophanes[113] may have inspired the Sidonian and Philonic cosmogonies. The similarity of the position of Eros in Hesiod and Pothos in Philo is particularly impressive. At the very least Greek sources may have caused Phoenicians to emphasize this aspect of their tradition. Similarly, it is difficult to decide whether the origin of life from mud represented Greek influence or was an observation made in the Near East.

Greek science thus explains those aspects of the cosmogony previously inexplicable. The conclusion that the cosmogony was written after the sixth century B.C. and had Greek sources is inescapable. The cosmogony thus represents the impact of Greek rationalism on native Phoenician speculation. Philo's cosmogony is a product of a native Phoenician tradition brought up to date and into harmony with the best science of the day--Greek science.[114]

This conclusion has important consequences for our understanding of the elements of the cosmogony. Since it certainly had some Greek sources it may have had others. That is, many aspects of it may have been suggested or reinforced by Greek speculation. It therefore seems useful to briefly indicate the parallels between the cosmogony and Greek sources.

The origin of the world from water goes back to Homer, _Iliad_ 14,200f. and 14,244ff. Aristotle (_Met_. A3, 983b6) attributes a similar idea to Thales. Empedocles made water and air two of his four elements (DK B 1, 17ff.). Zeno interpreted the Hesiodic _Chaos_ from the verb _cheesthai_, and thus understood it as watery (SVF 1, frag. 103).

---

[113] Hesiod, _Theog_. 120, Aristophanes, _Av_. 696.

[114] In this sense the Jewish and Phoenician Philos share more than a name.

XUM

Philo's misty wind is similar in origin to Anaximenes' aēr, which was an intermediate form of water. The aēr is boundless in both authors (DK A 5). The wind was an active agent in Stoic cosmology, as in Philo. Pneuma, for the Stoics, is composed of fire and air, but it has the ability of making the other two elements--earth and water--cohesive by intermingling completely with them. Pneuma is thus responsible for the physical qualities of nature.[115]

Mōt, either mud or the putrefaction of a watery mixture, is the seed of all things. Anaximander believed that animal life originated in moisture, while Empedocles thought that "all things that come-to-be and grow are earth and water." Lucretius states that animals are born from the earth which has been fertilized by rain, and the cosmogony in Diodorus 1,7,1-7, has life originating from fermenting pustules of clay. Spontaneous generation and putrefaction were thus two alternative theories among the Greeks.[116]

Mot was egg-shaped and blazed forth the heavenly luminaries. The cosmogony in Aristophanes, Aves 693ff. (which is a parody), has similar ideas. Even closer is the Orphic cosmogony according to the version of Hieronymus and Hellanicus (of which the sources of Aristophanes' parody may have been sources).[117]

---

[115] See SVF Vol. 2, Frags. 439, 440, and 449, and Sambursky, Physics of the Stoics, p. 13.

[116] See Anaximander DK A 30; Empedocles DK B 29; Lucretius 5,796-798; 806ff. On the cosmogony of Diodorus see K & R, p. 33, n. 1. On putrefaction and mud as alternative theories see Guthrie, ITB, pp. 29-45.

[117] See Damascius, De Prim.Princ. 123 bis, and Athenagoras, Pro Christianis 18, p. 20 Schwartz. These texts are collected in Kern, OF, frags. 54 and 57. See also Williams, pp. 43-44.

The Zophasemin may be bisexual, as are many monsters in the Orphic texts just mentioned. Aristophanes' famous speech in Plato, Symposium 189Eff. should also be noted. Finally, the idea of creation of life by the planets (or their gods or angels) may be derived from Plato, Timaeus, 41A-D.[118]

The cosmogony and the Greek texts are not always saying exactly the same thing, and their differences have not been noted in detail. Nevertheless, the features of the cosmogony mentioned may have been reinforced by these Greek sources, or even, sometimes, derived from them.

viii

The interpretation of the cosmogony attributed to Sanchuniathon and Taautos as a reworking of traditional Phoenician cosmogonic notions under the impact of Greek thought is supported by our knowledge of Oriental speculation during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Particularly instructive are certain passages in the Corpus Hermeticum and Gnostic literature. These passages show that Philo's cosmogony, as interpreted here, was not a unique event, that there were other hellenizing interpretations of traditional material.

The Jewish background of C.H. III has often been discussed.[119] Scott, for example, writes: "It is evident . . . that the writer of Corp. III knew the Mosaic account of the creation. But he also knew

---

[118] It seems remarkable that the significance of this passage for the history of Gnosticism in particular was only recently noticed by Boyancé, "Les Archontes de Platon," pp. 340-356.

[119] See Dodd, Bible and Greeks, pp. 212-234 and Nock in Vol. 1 of his edition of C.H., p. 43.

Stoic cosmology; and in this document he has tried to harmonize the one with the other."[120] Scott also noticed several similarities in detail between C.H. III and the cosmogony which Philo attributes to Sanchuniathon. However, he rewrote the Philonic and Hermetic texts so completely that his conclusions are of little value.[121]

The central assertion of C.H. III is that *physis* is *theia*, that nature is divine (C.H. III, 1 & 4). The cosmogonic process begins with a boundless darkness over the face of the abyss and a fine and intelligent wind (III, 1). These things existed in the chaos by divine power. A holy light detached itself from the watery substance and the elements condensed; the lighter elements rose and the heavier descended (III, 2). After the creation of the heavens and of the animals comes man. One of his functions is to observe the heavens, *eis katopteian ouranou* (III,3).

The combination of traditional and Greek ideas is apparent. The abyss and wind are Biblical notions, but the fineness and intelligence of the wind and the description of the separation of the elements are Stoic.[122] C.H. III is thus a hellenizing reinterpretation in the sense discussed above.[123] Moreover, while C.H. III differs from Philo's cosmogony in important details, most notably in its agenda, it agrees in others. Both texts speak of the primeval waters and wind, and the

---

[120] Scott, *Hermetica*, Vol. 2, p. 112.

[121] *Ibid.*, pp. 113-117.

[122] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-125.

[123] A similar case could be made for C.H. 1, but the traditional material being reworked is more difficult to identify, and the similarities to Philo's cosmogony less evident.

XUM

observation of the heavens is important in both.

One group of Gnostic texts, the cosmogony of the Nicolaitans, is even more strikingly similar to Philo's cosmogony. The Nicolaitan cosmogony is preserved in three versions, by Ps. Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Filastrius.[124] Ps. Tertullian, *Adv. omn. haer*. 1,6 writes:

> *hic dicit tenebras in concupiscentia luminis et quidem foeda et obscena fuisse; ex hac permixtione pudor est dicere quae foetida et immunda. sunt et cetera obscena: aeones enim refert quosdam turpitudinis natos et complexus et permixciones exsecrabiles obscenasque coniunctas et quaedam ex ipsis adhuc turpiora, natos praeterea daemones et deos et spiritus septem et alia satis sacrilegia pariter et foeda*.
>
> This fellow says that the darkness was desirous of the light--indeed an abominable and indecent desire. It is not proper to say which foul and abominable things came from this mixture. There are also other indecencies; for he says certain Aeons were born of infamy, and he reports the cursed and indecent embraces and mixtures which were joined in, and certain things issued from these, but even more shameful. And, besides, he tells how daemons, and gods and seven spirits were born and he relates other things alike sufficiently impious and abominable.[125]

The second account is that of Filastrius (*Haer*. 33, 3 ff. p. 18, 8 ff. Marx):

> *ante, inquit, erant solum tenebrae et profundum et aqua, atque, ex his divisio facta est in medio et spiritus separavit haec elementa. tunc ergo tenebrae inruentes in spiritum genuerunt quattuor aeonas et isti quattuor genuerunt alios quattuor aeonas. hoc autem dextra atque sinistra, lux inquit, sunt et tenebrae. quendam etiam concubuisse cum illa muliere et virtute dicunt, de qua nati sunt dii et homines et angeli et septem spiritus daemoniorum*.
>
> In the beginning, he says, there were only darkness, the deep and water. And out of these a division was made in the middle and the wind separated these elements. Well then, the darkness rushing into the wind begat four Aeons and these four begat four other Aeons. Moreover, he says, in this manner the right and left, light and darkness came into being. They also say that a certain

---

[124] I am far from the first person to have noticed these similarities. See Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 103ff.

[125] Latin text from *Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat*.

> male had intercourse with that female power from which gods, men, angels and the seven spirits of the daemons were born.

The final text is Epiphanius, *Panarion haer*. 25,5ff., p. 272, 19ff. Holl. This version seems to be the most complete and was the source of Filastrius' version:

> σκότος ἦν καὶ βυθὸς καὶ ὕδωρ, τὸ δε πνεῦμα ἀνὰ μέσον τούτων διορισμὸν ἐποιήσατο αὐτῶν. τὸ δὲ σκότος ἦν χαλεπαῖνον τε καὶ ἐγκοτοῦν τῷ πνεύματι, ὅπερ σκότος ἀναδραμὸν περιεπλάκη τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐγέννησε. φησίν, τινὰ Μήτραν καλουμένην, ἥτις γεννηθεῖσα ἐνεκίσσησεν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πνεύματι. ἐκ δὲ τῆς Μήτρας προεβλήθησάν τινες τέσσαρες αἰῶνες, ἐκ δὲ τῶν τεσσάρων αἰώνων ἄλλοι δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ γέγονε δεξία τε καὶ ἀριστερά, φῶς καὶ σκότος. ὕστερον δὲ μετὰ πάντας τούτους προβεβλῆσθαί τινα αἰσχρὸν αἰῶνα, μεμίχθαι δὲ τοῦτον τῇ Μήτρᾳ τῇ ἄνω προδεδηλωμένη καὶ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ αἰσχροῦ καὶ τῆς Μήτρας γεγονέναι θεούς τε καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ δαίμονας καὶ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα.

> Darkness, the deep and water existed. And the wind made a division in the midst of these. But the darkness was complaining and envying the wind. And this darkness, rushing up, embraced the wind and begat, he says, a certain female called Mētra (Womb), who having been born,conceived of the same wind. And from Mētra were brought forth some four Aeons, from the four Aeons another fourteen; and the right and left, light and darkness came into being. But later, after all these, a certain shameful Aeon was brought forth and this Aeon had intercourse with the aforementioned Mētra; and from this shameful Aeon and Mētra were born gods, angels, daemons and the seven spirits.

The scheme of this cosmogony is as follows. Darkness, the deep and water are the first elements. *Pneuma*, either composed of these elements or additional to them, divides them. Darkness, the active agent, unites with *pneuma* and *Mētra* (Womb) results. *Mētra* bears four Aeons fathered by the *pneuma* and these four Aeons produce another four (we must accept the reading of Filastrius): right and left, light and darkness. Finally, a shameful Aeon, who was born later, unites with *Mētra* and the gods, angels, the daemons, the seven spirits, and according to Filastrius men, are born.

The similarities between this cosmogony and that which Philo claimed to have translated from Sanchuniathon are numerous and significant. The first elements in the Nicolaitan cosmogony--darkness, the deep and water--are equivalent to the first element in Philo's cosmogony--the dark and turbid chaos. The next steps in both cosmogonies are the same. Wind (perhaps produced by the watery elements), unites with the dark element--in Philo it is the dark earth and water of chaos, in the Nicolaitans the darkness. In the Nicolaitan cosmogony, according to Epiphanius, the product of the union is called Mētra, in Philo Pothos. In both cosmogonies the product of the union of the waters and the wind then unites with the wind.[126] According to Philo Mōt results, according to the Nicolaitans four Aeons. From this point onward the cosmogonies differ. However, both present the same scheme for the first stages of the cosmogonic process, and the motif of incest plays an important role in both.[127] The most significant differences in the early stages are that the wind seems to have an active role in Philo while darkness plays the active role in the Nicolaitan cosmogony, and the function of incest may differ in the two cosmogonies. The function of incest is not clear in Philo, but it must have been proof and cause of the evil nature of the material world for the Gnostics.[128]

---

[126] For the Nicolaitans Epiphanius is supported against Filastrius (who omits this step) by Ps. Tertullian's indication that there was another "more shameful" (therefore probably incestuous) union here.

[127] In the version of Epiphanius, the shamefulness of the deeds is not mentioned until the last union, that of the shameful Aeon with Mētra. The versions of Ps. Tertullian and Filastrius, however, speak of the monstrosity of the very first stages of the process. Thus both the cosmogony and these Gnostics place the first case of incest at the outset.

[128] See e.g. Jonas, Gnostic Religion, pp. 42-44.

XUM

The Hermetic and Gnostic texts cited establish a point vital to the inquiry, that Philo's cosmogony as interpreted here was not *sui generis*. Not only do we have Eudemus' report of a similar Phoenician cosmogony from the fourth century B.C. at the latest, but the neighbors of the Phoenicians were also engaged in reinterpreting their traditional doctrines in the light of Greek philosophy. Indeed the results of the efforts of the Phoenicians and their neighbors are remarkably alike. The results seem so similar that it is tempting to suppose that Philo's source was written in its final form at approximately the same time as *C.H. III* and the cosmogony of the Nicolaitans. A date at the very end of the first century B.C. or during the first two centuries A.D. seems proper.[129] This would be close to the time when Philo himself was active.

ix

The Philonic cosmogony, as was previously established, was written with the same techniques as Biblical and Ugaritic poetry. The analysis of the contents has shown that the cosmogony, while based on ancient Phoenician traditions was also influenced by Greek rationalism. Now, Philo claims that he is translating Sanchuniathon, and while we cannot determine whether a text written by Sanchuniathon was translated we may ask whether Philo did *any* translating. That is, thus far in the argument the assumption has been made that the immediate source of

---

[129] For the Hermetica see Nock's comment in Vol. 1 of his edition, p. v. The Gnostic Nicolaitans were known to Irenaeus (130-200 A.D.). They may be the group discussed in Chapter Two of Revelations. The similarities between the cosmogony and the Gnostic texts may have implications for the history of Gnosticism. These implications, however, are beyond the scope of the present work.

XUM

the cosmogony was a Phoenician poem. We must now ask whether this assumption was justified. Perhaps the cosmogony was a de novo composition in Greek (based of course on traditional Phoenician sources and employing the parallelistic technique).

In favor of a Phoenician original are the poetic form and the recurrent use of kai. On the other hand, Wisdom of Solomon demonstrates the possibility of a work composed in Greek which employs the parallelistic technique; and the excessive use of kai is attested in books of the New Testament composed in Greek.[130] Also in favor of a Greek original is the relative simplicity of this hypothesis. We must assume only that a Phoenician familiar with both his native and Greek speculation wrote a cosmogony in Greek in which he employed his traditional poetic technique. A Phoenician original requires the more complex assumption that a Hellenized Phoenician wrote a poem in his native language which embodied the results of his synthesis of Phoenician and Greek ideas. This poem would then have been translated into Greek, perhaps by Philo. But the argument of the relative simplicity of a Greek original is not convincing. Ben Sira is an example of precisely the supposedly more complex assumption: a text influenced by Hellenism, written in the native Semitic language and in the native poetic form, later translated into Greek.[131]

It would therefore seem that the question of the original language of the cosmogony is not answerable, and is not very important for an

---

[130] See Blass and Debrunner, Grammar of the NT, paragraph 442, pp. 227-9. See also note 31.

[131] See note 30.

XUM

appreciation of its contents.[132] In the absence of decisive evidence to the contrary (such as proof that Philo knew very little Phoenician) there seems to be insufficient reason to doubt Philo's claim of having translated texts from Phoenician to Greek.

x

Much has been written concerning the nature and date of the source of Philo's cosmogony. The conclusions presented here have been reached through a series of steps. The ultimate source was Phoenician. The Phoenician source either knew the cosmogony of Hermopolis or--more likely--knew Phoenician material which had taken over and reshaped important elements of that cosmogony. However, the date of the Phoenician source--whether a document or a tradition--of Philo must not be set solely by the ancient reminiscences it contains but by all the reflections of its style and content in Philo's work. The poetic style eliminates a date in the second millenium B.C. and establishes a date sometime thereafter. The poetic form was an important factor in the conclusion that the cosmogony came from a different source than the rest of the fragments. The contents, in particular the demythologizing tendency and scientific meteorology, date the more proximate source of the cosmogony after the sixth century B.C. They also indicate that the cosmogony must have had some Greek sources. Finally, the comparison with the Hermetica and Gnostic speculations suggest a date in the first centuries A.D.

---

[132] The choice of one alternative has some implications for the explanation of the occasional lack of parallelism in the cosmogony. In an earlier section of this chapter I tentatively concluded that this was due to the abridgements of the translator. Clearly, if the cosmogony was written _de novo_ in Greek this conclusion is erroneous. In view of the late date I have assigned to the more proximate source of the cosmogony another explanation of the occasional lack of parallelism is possible and should be mentioned. The authors of Wisdom of Solomon and of the Damascus Covenant often lapsed from the use of poetic parallelism. These lapses are part of a pattern, apparent even in Biblical texts, that parallelism is less strictly and consistently used in texts of later date. This pattern may be relevant to the cosmogony. On Wisdom of Solomon and the Damascus Covenant see notes 29 and 31 above.

These conclusions stand in sharp contrast with Porphyry's direct and Philo's indirect dates for Sanchuniathon. Both would place Sanchuniathon, Philo's alleged source, in the second millenium B.C. or in the very early first millenium. The Greco-Roman concerns betrayed by these dates and by the other biographical data concerning Sanchuniathon have aroused suspicion as to the true date of the sources of the information Philo claims to have derived from Sanchuniathon. For the cosmogony at least, these suspicions have been confirmed.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE DISCOVERERS

i

The fragments to be considered in this chapter begin with cosmogony. The focus quickly changes to narration of the discovery, by pairs of discoverers of the necessities of civilized human life, from food and fire, to houses, boats, clothing and medicine. The key to understanding these fragments, implicit though not explicitly formulated in Lokkegaard's analysis,[1] is provided by the discussion of Chousor. Philo makes Chousor and his brother(s) humans, the inventors of iron-working and other crafts, while the Ugaritic epics have taught us that Chousor was the craftsman god. Philo, in his characteristically Euhemeristic fashion, has turned a god into a mortal and the sphere of divine activity into the mortal's invention. This analysis suggests that all the inventors and inventions in this section would be described as gods and their functions by a non-Euhemerist. The commentary therefore must try to present the mortal inventors and inventions as they would be conceived by a more traditionally minded, or non-Euhemeristic, Phoenician. The identity of the god lurking behind Philo's mortal inventor must be established and the invention must somehow be connected with that god's functions. Our information about the Phoenician religion is so sparse that this task often cannot be completed.

---

[1] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 61. Gen. 4:17ff., as Lokkegaard realized, is a general parallel to this section, as it too is a list of discoverers.

ii

Translation of Texts Discussed[2]

(Eusebius)

(807:19) Then he says:

(Philo)

that from the wind Kolpia and his wife Baau (and that he renders "Night") there were born Aion and Protogonos, mortal men called by these names. Aion discovered the food obtained from trees. (807:20) The children born of them were called Genos and Genea and they settled Phoenicia. And when there were droughts, they stretched out their hands to heaven, towards the sun. (807:23) For (he says) they considered him the sole god, the ruler of heaven, calling him Beelsamen, which means to the Phoenicians "Ruler of Heaven," but to the Greeks "Zeus."

(Eusebius)

(807:26) After this passage he charges the Greeks with an error saying:

(Philo)

It is not without reason that we have explained these things in many different ways, but it is on account of the later varieties of interpretation of the names in the history which [names] the Greeks in their ignorance, misled by the ambiguity of the translation, misunderstood.

---

[2] I have argued in Chapter Five that the section 807:10-19 is a part of Philo's introduction and should be moved there. The text considered in this chapter accordingly begins with 807:19. It is difficult to be certain which passages are direct citations of Philo and which are Eusebius' paraphrase: Jacoby and Mras differ radically. I have generally followed Mras except at the beginning of the text considered in this chapter. I am almost obliged to disagree with Mras by my having moved 807:10-19 which Mras considers as belonging here.

(Eusebius)

(808:2) Next he says:

(Philo)

From Genos, the son of Aion and Protogonos, there again were born mortal children whose names were Phos, Pyr and Phlox. (808:4) These (he says) by rubbing sticks together discovered fire, and they taught its use. And they begot sons who in size and eminence were greater [than their fathers] (808:5) and whose names were given to the mountain ranges over which they ruled so that the Kassios, the Lebanon, the Anti-Lebanon and the Brathys were called after them. (808:7) From these (he says) were born Samemroumos who is also [called] Hypsouranios and Ousoos. And (he says), they called themselves after their mothers, since the women of that time united freely with anyone upon whom they chanced.

(Eusebius)

(808:10) Then he says

(Philo)

[that] Hypsouranios settled Tyre and he invented huts made from reeds, and rushes and papyrus. And he quarreled with his brother Ousoos, who first contrived a covering for the body from skins of the animals he was able to capture. (808:12) When there were furious rains and winds the trees in Tyre, rubbing against each other, caught fire, and their wood burned. (808:14) Ousoos, having taken part of a tree and lopped

off the branches, was the first to dare set out to sea. And he consecrated two stelai to Fire and to Wind and poured as a libation to them the blood of the animals he caught. (808:17) When Hypsouranios and Oussos died, he says, their survivors consecrated staves to them, worshiped the stelai [of Ousoos], and celebrated yearly festivals in their honor. (808:19) But many years later, from the family of Hypsouranios were born Agreus and Halieus who discovered hunting and fishing, and hunters and fishermen were called after them. (808:21) From them were born two brothers the discoverers of iron and of the method of working it. One of these [brothers named] Chusor, composed [magical] formulas and incantations and prophecies; (808:23) and he was Hephaistos. He also discovered the fishhook and bait and the fishing line and the raft, and was the first of all men to sail. (808:24) Therefore they also revered him as a deity after his death. And he was also called Zeus Meilichius. Some say that his brothers discovered the use of bricks to make walls. (808:26) Thereafter from their family two youths were born, one of whom was called Technites and the other Geinos Autochthon. They discovered the mixing of chaff with the clay of bricks and drying them in the sun. (809:1) Moreover, they discovered roofs. From these were born others one of whom was called Agros, another the Hero of Agros or Agrotes. (809:2) There is a statue of the latter which is much revered and a shrine drawn by a pair of oxen in Phoenicia. (809:4) By the Byblians in particular he is called the greatest of the gods. These thought of adding courtyards, enclosures and cellars to houses. They are the ancestors of [ordinary] hunters and those who use dogs in hunting. They are also called Wanderers or Titans. (809:6) From them were born Amunos and Magos who introduced villages and flocks. (809:7)

From them were born Misor and Sydyk, that is Easily-solved and Just, who discovered the use of salt. From Misor [came] Taautos who devised the alphabetic writing, and whom the Egyptians called Thouth, the Alexandrians Thoth, and the Greeks Hermes. (809:11) Sydyk fathered the Dioskouroi or Kabeiroi or Korybants or Samothracians. These, he says, were the first to invent a ship. (809:12) They gave birth to others who discovered herbs, a cure for venomous animal bites, and charms.

iii

807:19-20 Kolpia & Baau.

As presented by Eusebius (undoubtedly following Philo), this passage is anthropogony: the union of Kolpia and Baau produces the first mortal humans.[3] Since, however, Eusebius follows Philo and Philo Euhemerizes, the humans are certainly ex-deities and the passage may have originally been theogonic or cosmogonic. That it was so is pretty clearly indicated by the characters in the first part of it, as will be shown below.

The attempts to understand Kolpia divide into two groups: Kolpia is either a Greek or a Semitic word. The Greek explanation, first suggested by Cumberland, understands Kolpia as a wind from a kolpos, a bay or gulf.[4] This interpretation would be supported by the fact that a gulf near Aradus was called hieros kolpos by the ancients.[5]

---

[3] So identified by Eissfeldt, T. und S., pp. 38-39. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 57-58.

[4] Cumberland, p. 209.

[5] See Steph. Byz. s.v. hieros kolpos.

Philo's Kolpia might then be a wind from that gulf. If Kolpia is a Greek name, however, why is it not declined (ἐκ τοῦ Κολπία ἀνέμου)? Philo usually declines all Greek proper names.[6] The Semitic interpretations of the name are therefore more probable.

A Semitic interpretation of Kolpia was proposed by Bochart, one of the earliest commentators on the fragments. He suggested that Kolpia was a transliteration of קול פי יה, *vox oris dei*, the voice of the mouth of God.[7] This interpretation, and the obvious allusion to Gen. 1:2, is unlikely. It makes Philo's sources too Biblical and too Yahwistic.[8]

Lokkegaard has recently proposed understanding Kolpia as a transliteration of קול פאה, a destructive thunder, or hurricane followed by thunder.[9] This interpretation is quite attractive as פאה is used in Deut. 32:26 in a context where it must mean destroy or smite to pieces.[10] Furthermore, Baal's *ql* or thunder is described in the Ugaritic epics as smashing the clouds,[11] and thunder appeared above as

---

[6] Greek proper names are, of course, normally declined. Philo's usage with Semitic proper names varies. Sometimes they are declined such as El in the accusative (808:22) and genitive (810:18); Ousoos in the accusative (808:11); Demarous in the dative (811:10); Baaltis in the dative (812:12); Astarte in the accusative (812:3). Other semitic proper names are not declined such as Misor and Sydyk (809:7ff.) or Chousor (808:22).

[7] Bochart, p. 705.

[8] This interpretation was already attacked by Ewald p. 40, n. 2 as a relic of earlier ignorance. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 38ff. has inexplicably revived it.

[9] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 57, n. 2.

[10] See Held, "Additional Pairs," p. 151, n. 31.

[11] Gordon, *UT*, 51:VII:28. Dr. Held informs me that *bdqt* in this passage means "rifts in the clouds," as is proved by the Akkadian.

XUM

the cause of the generation of sexually differentiated creatures. Lokkegaard's interpretation is therefore supported by Ugaritic usage and myth.

The interpretation of Baau is complicated by Philo's statement that her name means night. Bochart, for example, neglected to consider Baau's functions in the passage and only tried to make her name mean night. He suggested that the text should be emended so that her name became Baaut,[12] which he took as a transliteration of Aramaic בת, which means to spend the night as in Dan. 6:19.[13]

Lokkegaard attempts a Ugaritic interpretation, proposing that Baau is a transliteration of Baʿu or Baǵu, which means desire. Baau would thus be an equivalent of Pothos in the cosmogony. One of Baau's names, according to Lokkegaard, would have been Night, which would explain Philo's translation. Finally, according to Lokkegaard, Philo's transliteration shows that the ǵ has become an ʿ; Philo has the name in its younger form.[14] A minor difficulty with Lokkegaard's interpretation is that Ugaritic bǵy and Hebrew בעה mean to request or wish and not to desire.[15] This difficulty is not however insuperable as request and wish are close to desire. More serious is that if Baau's name meant desire why does Philo call her Night?

The best explanation of Baau may be the one suggested by many of the earliest commentators on the fragments. Baau is understood as a transliteration of Hebrew בהו, known from Gen. 1:2.[16] Again, as in Genesis, Baau is associated with night. This interpretation is admittedly not completely satisfying as the meaning of בהו is dubious.[17] Nevertheless, it seems more consistent with available knowledge and Philo's words than other interpretations proposed.[18]

---

[12] Bochart assumes that the text originally read Baaut touto, and that the first t was omitted by haplography.

[13] Bochart, p. 705. I have no quarrel with Bochart's assertion that בת in Dan. 6:19 means to spend the night.

[14] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 58, n. 2.

[15] For Ugaritic bǵy see Driver CML, p. 164a and Gordon, UT, #496, p. 375. Hebrew בעה appears in Isa. 21:12.

It was suggested at the outset that the section under discussion was originally cosmogonic. This suggestion is confirmed by these interpretations of Kolpia and Baau. Kolpia, a wind, and Baau unite to produce Aion and Protogonos (on these two see below). The similarities to the first verses of Genesis are obvious.

807:20 Aion

As is usual in the Septuagint, Greek Aion must render Hebrew (or Phoenician) עלם.[19] When Philo wrote Aion he could have intended either the contemporary Greek concept, the Phoenician or Canaanite עלם, or both. Both the Greek and Phoenician notions therefore must be investigated.

---

[16] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 814, n. 1 and many others have proposed this interpretation. I should stress that the connection with Genesis, according to this interpretation is primarily philological and does not necessitate our assuming that Philo or his sources were familiar with the Bible. The objection to the overly Biblical interpretation of Kolpia noted above is therefore not relevant.

[17] Cf. Orelli, p. 14, n. 13.

[18] Another possibility is to correct Kolpia to kolpiou, an adjective meaning "of the deep," and take kolpios anemos as the equivalent of רוח תהום. In this event we have רוח, תהום, and בהו as in Genesis, with the wind as the generative force, which it probably was in the Genesis story in its original form.

[19] For the Septuagint see Hatch and Redpath s.v. aion. On Phoenician עלם see Harris, Grammar, s.v. עלם, p. 133.

By Philo's day, Greek Aion had become an important philosophical concept. Having been discussed by Plato,[20] Aion now was a creator in philosophical cosmology. Thus in *C.H. XI*, Aion is an intermediate creator in the chain of creations leading downwards from God.[21] Aion was, however, also associated with the sun,[22] and was also understood as the world order.[23]

Among the Semites עלם had similar associations.[24] Cross, following Cassuto, has argued that עלם was an epithet of the god El.[25] El is the creator god of Ugaritic myth and this meaning would accordingly make sense in Isa. 40:28 where אלהי עולם is identified with YHWH and described as ברא קצות הארץ. Cross states but does not emphasize the fact that עלם also appears as the epithet of the sun god. A Ugaritic text, 2008:7, mentions *špš ʿlm*, and the Azitawada inscription speaks of שמש עלם.[26] This interpretation would be supported by Gen. 21:33 where YHWH אל עולם is honored by planting trees. The connection of a sun god and trees is obvious. The interpretation might also be supported by Isa. 40:28 if ברא in that verse is understood as meaning "to see:" the sun god obviously sees to the ends of the

---

[20] Plato, *Timaeus*, 37C-38E.

[21] On this see further Nock, "Vision," p. 83.

[22] *Ibid*., p. 84.

[23] See Lackeit, "Aion," col. 66.

[24] The similarities between Greek Aion and Phoenician עלם were first noticed by Montgomery, "The Highest Heaven," pp. 146-150.

[25] See Gordon, UT, 76:III:6-7. On the reading of these lines see Held, "Factitive-Passive," p. 282, n. 68. On עלם=El see Cassuto, "El Olam," p. 287 and Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," pp. 236-241.

[26] KAI 26 A III, line 19.

XUM

earth.[27] Finally, שמש עלם and its transliterations are frequent in magic.[28]

Phoenician עלם and Greek Aion suggest a remarkably similar set of associations. Philo's Aion, standing at the beginning of a cosmogony could well stand for the current world order: the wind Kolpia and Baau produced the world as we know it. When Aion is connected with the discovery of food from trees the solar associations of both Aion and עלם are obviously relevant. The sun is always connected with plant life and אל עולם of Gen. 21:33 is honored with trees. The sun god of Greek myth also had a famous orchard.[29] Both Greek and Phoenician concepts could therefore have suggested Philo's Aion.

A final confirmation of the cosmogonic nature of the original of these lines is afforded by their similarity to the cosmogony of Mochos, preserved by Damascius. Here Aion=עלם is the product of the union of the wind Kolpia and Baau. In Mochos, Oulomos is the offspring of Aither and Aer, or, in the alternate version, of the winds Lips and Notos.[30] Aion=עלם must have been a traditional figure of Phoenician cosmogony, appearing in translation in Philo, in transliteration in Mochos.

---

[27] The verse in Isaiah may mean that אלהי עולם sees to the ends of the earth as the context and comparison with Job 28:24 suggest. In BH ברא was therefore emended to ראה ל. Dr. Held suggests that the emendation may be unnecessary since ברא can mean to see in Akkadian, CAD Vol. 2, p. 115.

[28] See Höfer, "Semesilam," col. 677.

[29] See Rose, Handbook, p. 216.

[30] FGrH 784 F 4. The similarities to Mochos also help in determining the provenance of the material presented in this section of the fragments. Several other points in this section suggest a Tyrian provenance (see below) and Mochos may have been Tyrian. See FGrH 784 F 3b; Cf. F 6.

807:20 Protogonos

Protogonos, Philo would have us believe, is the other first mortal human, as his name suggests. Protogonos has usually been seen as a translation of Hebrew and Phoenician קדמון,[31] but this has helped little in identifying the deity behind the title or his function. Lokkegaard has recently suggested that Protogonos was the sun, as implied by the context.[32] Nothing in the context, however, suggests any function for Protogonos so his identity remains dubious. Protogonos and Aion are the parents of Genos and Genea (808:2) The names of both parents are masculine so that one might have been bisexual. Since Aion's name is put first perhaps Protogonos was the bisexual partner. This possibility would be supported by the other legends about the bisexuality of the first men.[33]

807:22 Genos and Genea

These are the children of Aion and Protogonos, as is suggested by their names. The text emphasizes that they were Phoenicians, that they settled Phoenicia, underlining one of Philo's basic concerns: everything important or useful happened first in Phoenicia.

Genos and Genea must be translations of some Phoenician names, yet the actual names have not been identified. Several nineteenth century scholars proposed emending Genos to Gainos=Cain of Genesis,[34] but this is hardly plausible. Lokkegaard was correct in realizing that we cannot determine the gods hiding behind these names.[35]

---

[31] See e.g. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 814, n. 1, and Lagrange, p. 370, n. 2. קדמון is not found in known Phoenician inscriptions, but קדם and קדמת are found. See Harris, Grammar, s.v. קדם, p. 143.

[32] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 58.

[33] See Aristophanes' speech in Plato, Symposium, 189Eff., and others. See also Gen.Rabbah, p. 55 (Theodor-Albeck).

[34] Orelli, p. 15, n. 17.

Although little positive can be said about this pair several incorrect notions should be noted and disproven. Lokkegaard calls Genos and Genea the "Phoenician Adam and Eve,"[36] which does not fit Eusebius' report of Philo's account, where Aion and Protogonos are explicitly called the first mortals. Clemen connects Philo's characters with the god Genneas known from inscriptions,[37] but the connection is tenuous at best.[38]

807:22-23 auchmōn - hēlion

The origins of religion are explained rationalistically--prayer begins at a time of need.[39] The sun is worshiped with raised hands, a ritual act to be discussed in detail below.

807:24 Beelsamēn

Philo correctly identifies the Greek equivalent of Beelsamen or Baalshamem (בעל שמם in Phoenician) as Zeus.[40] Baalshamem is also the proper god to entreat at a time of droughts as he controls the winds and presumably the rains.[41] The difficulty in the text lies in the identification of this god (and Zeus) with the sun, a difficulty first noticed by Bernays who proposed emending *hēlion* of 807:24 to ἦλον or El.[42] El, he thought, was the proper name of the god, Baalshamem his title. But the Ugaritic epics have shown that El is an independent god, unconnected with the storm god.

---

[35] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 58. [36] Ibid.

[37] E.g. IGLS 2594 or 1301. Clemen, pp. 42-43.

[38] See Cumont, "Gennaios," col. 1154, and Seyrig and Starcky, "Genneas," pp. 230-257; Cf. Teixidor, BES 1969, p. 326, # 41.

[39] Cf. Josephus, AJ, 12,259.

[40] See the inscription in Cooke, Textbook, p. 296, n. 1.

[41] This is clearest from the treaty of Esarhaddon and Baalu of Tyre, line 10. Translation in ANET Supplement, p. 98.

Albright believes that the text's sources may be Tyrian and may date from the Amarna period when Tyre was closely connected with Akhenaton's family and the sun god was identified with Baalshamem.[43] But it seems unlikely that a short-lived Egyptian religious revolution changed Phoenician beliefs and that these beliefs survived to be preserved by Philo. The latter assumption, in particular, runs against much that has been shown concerning the dates of Philo's sources. Similarly, it is impossible to suppose with Williams that since *Beelsamēn* in our passage is accusative, the nominative form might be *Beelsamēs*, 𐤁𐤏𐤋 𐤔𐤌𐤔 in Phoenician, the Baal of the sun.[44] Long after Philo's death St. Augustine still knew that Baalshamem was the Lord of Heaven.[45] Philo could not have been so ignorant that, having seen *Beelsamēn* in his sources, he construed it as the accusative of *Beelsamēs* and identified the god with the sun. Nor could he have written *Beelsamēn*, intending it to be understood as the accusative of *Beelsamēs*, without informing his reader of the extremely unusual usage. *Beelsamēn*, without any further extensive explanation, identified with Zeus, and prayed to at a time of drought, must be Baalshamem.

---

[42] Bernays, *ap*. Bunsen Vol. 5, p. 815, n. 1.

[43] Albright, *YGC*, pp. 229-230. He calls this interpretation "possible."

[44] In the context of a discussion of various semitic words in Philo Williams discusses the implications of the "accusative" form, p. 31. On pp. 157-158, in his comments on this passage, Williams does not realize the problem, nor see that the idea proposed on p. 31 might help solve it.

[45] Baal=Dominum; Samem=Caelum. See *Quaest in Hept*. 7,16 (*ad* Jud 2:13) (*PL* 34,797).

The correct solution is most likely Seyrig's; he suggests that Philo's identification of Baalshamem and the sun is an example (indeed the earliest attested example) of philosophical solar pantheism.[46] The identification could not then go back to Sanchuniathon or any of Philo's sources but should be attributed to Philo himself.

The gesture of raising both hands in prayer to the gods is old. Evidence, as collected by Cumont,[47] shows that the sun was thus worshiped in Philo's day.[48]

807:26-808:2 *meta - metaphraseōs*

In the full text of the *Phoenician History* Philo must have discussed the opinions of numerous other scholars, especially Greeks who were misled by their ignorance of Phoenician.[49] In the fragments as preserved we have little to help identify these opponents, their theories, or why Philo disagreed with them.[50]

808:2 *Genous*

Editors of the text have disagreed whether one should read Γένους or γένους. On the former reading Pyr, Phos, and Phlox were the children

---

[46] Seyrig, "AS 93," p. 111. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 54 and Cumont, "Deux Autels," pp. 163-168.

[47] See Cumont, "Cultes Solaires," pp. 386-392. The gesture of raising one hand is of course much better known, but Philo seems to be describing raising two hands.

[48] Cf. Yadin, *Hazor*, Vol. 1, p. 89 for the famous stele showing two hands raised to the moon god.

[49] See 805:16-22.

[50] But see Chapter Ten, pp. 293-302.

XUM

of Genos, the son of Aion and Protogonos. On the latter they were born from the race of Aion and Protogonos.[51] Philo's usage, e.g. 808:27, suggests that the former reading is preferable. When someone is born from the family of someone else, the parents or ancestors are the immediately preceding characters. If one reads *genous* the text would state that Pyr, Phos and Phlox were born from the family of Aion and Protogonos and would skip Genos and Genea. The reading *Genous* conforms to the usual pattern.

808:3 *Phōs, Pyr, Phlox*

These are the usual Greek words meaning light, fire and flame. Scholars have disagreed whether they were fictions made up to suit their inventions,[52] or three Phoenician gods.[53] On the principle established at the beginning of the chapter the latter is preferable. Lokkegaard attempted to identify these gods with figures known from Ugaritic epics. While his identifications may not be wholly accurate, the approach is probably correct. He identifies *Phōs* with Ugaritic *ar*. *Ar*, however, is only known from the place name *Bt Ar* and there is no proof that a god of fire had that name.[54] He also suggests that *Pyr* is Ugaritic *nr* of text 17:10. But that text reads *wnr* and there is no reason to believe that the text must mean "and *Nr*," and that *nr* is a divine name. The third identification, that of *Phlox* with Ugaritic *išt*,[55] is apt. *Išt* is a goddess of fire.[56] The connection of the

---

[51] See the critical apparatus *ad loc*.

[52] E.g. Renan, p. 261 and Eissfeldt, *T. und S*. p. 20.

[53] E.g. Clemen, p. 41 and Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 58-59.

[54] See Gordon, *UT*, #324, p. 365.

[55] Ugaritic *išt* appears in Gordon *UT*, ʿnt:III:43. Cf. Held,

XUM

three kinds of fire with the mountain chains is obscure.[57]

808:4-7 huious - Brathy

As has long been recognized, the story told in these lines is very similar to the Jewish legends of the fallen angels and to the account in Nonnus, Dionysiaca Bk. 40.[58] Philo's story must first be independently understood. He tells of four mortal giants, greater in size than their fathers,[59] who ruled mountains to which they gave their names. As Eissfeldt saw, a non-Euhemerist would have spoken of the four Baals of these mountains.[60] Indeed, evidence is not hard to find that there were Baals, acknowledged and worshiped, of at least three of the four mountains Philo mentions.

Zeus Kassios, the god of the mountain in Hellenistic times, is clearly the equivalent of בעל צפן, known from Ugaritic,[61] the Baalu treaty,[62] and Phoenician inscriptions.[63] As Zeus Kassios he was worshiped in much of the eastern Mediterranean.[64] An undated Greek

---

"Additional Pairs," p. 146, n. 38. The Ugaritic passage has dbb, which is not the equivalent of Hebrew שביב. There may have been a fire goddess שביב in Ugarit or Canaan but she is not attested.

[56] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 58-59.

[57] See I Kings 18:24 and 18:35.

[58] The similarity to Jewish stories was first noticed by Orelli, p. 17, n. 24. The parallels with Nonnus were first noticed by Eissfeldt, RS, p. 133.

[59] The Greek phrase in Philo is derived from that in Homer Il. 1, 404.

[60] Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 16. [61] Gordon, UT, #2185, p. 475.

[62] Baalu treaty, line 10, ANET Supplement, p. 98.

[63] E.g., KAI 50, lines 2-3. See the comments in KAI ad loc.

[64] Eissfeldt, Baal Zaphon, pp. 30-48.

XUM

inscription, found on Mt. Kassios itself, is probably dedicated to Διο(ς) Κασσίο[υ].[65] Baal Lebanon is somewhat less widely known and worshiped. We know of the god from CIS 1,5=KAI 31, where he is honored by the governor of Q̣rthdšt. The Baal of Anti-Lebanon is the Baal of Mt. Sirjon or Hermon,[66] mentioned in Jud. 3:3.[67]

Mt. Brathy has been an enigma to many commentators on the fragments. Orelli, for example, says "I have searched for this name in vain in the geographical writers."[68] Bunsen says that Brathy can "be found nowhere."[69] Two solutions to this enigma have been proposed, neither of which is wholly satisfactory. Lagrange suggested that Brathy was intended by Philo not as the name of a mountain but as a Greek word meaning cypress. The usage of brathy to mean cypress is attested and the word seems to have entered Greek as a transliteration of Semitic ברוש.[70] Furthermore, Theodotion transliterated ברוש of Isa. 41:19 as brathy, and some of the Septuagint MSS. of that verse have the same reading. In order to fit the context, Lagrange supposes that cypresses have been substituted for the mountains with which they were pre-eminently associated. Instead of mentioning the name of the fourth mountain, Philo inserted the name of the tree with which the mountain was identified. The mountain of cypresses, according to Lagrange is the Amanus.[71]

---

[65] IGLS 1226. For Mt. Kassios in the Typhon myth see Apollodorus, Bib. 1,6,3.

[66] See Deut. 3:9. [67] See Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 34.

[68] Orelli, p. 16, n. 22.

[69] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 817, n. 4.

[70] See LSJ s.v. βράθυ.

[71] Lagrange, p. 371.

XUM

Albright[72] and Peckham[73] were both tempted to complete Lagrange's thesis and to suppose that Philo was referring to the god a non-Euhemerist would have called בעל חמן, known from KAI 24 and other inscriptions. The difficulty with this theory is that it requires the unusual assumption that Philo substituted the name of the trees for the name of the mountain. It would have been so much simpler, natural, and less confusing for him to have written Amanus if that had been his intention.

The second solution, first proposed by Bunsen, supposes that Brathy is a scribal error for Mt. Tabor.[74] Some scribe's original read θαβυρ, which he confused and metathesized into Βραθυ. Perhaps this scribe was confused because Philo had written θαβυρ instead of the usual Greek name for Mt. Tabor, 'Ιταβυριον. Mt. Tabor also fits the context quite well, since there is some Biblical evidence for the existence of a Baal Tabor.[75] Finally, if Brathy refers to Mt. Tabor the geographical sequence of the mountains makes sense: from Zaphon in the far north down through the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon to Mt. Tabor. While this explanation of Brathy is superior to the one discussed above it is still not wholly satisfying. It requires our assuming that a scribe accidentally corrupted a perfectly intelligible reference to Mt. Tabor and so produced the enigmatic Brathy. But such accidental corruptions, especially of proper names, are common in ancient MSS.

---

[72] Albright, "Clemen," pp. 211-212.

[73] Peckham, Development, p. 14, n. 6.

[74] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 817, n. 4. This solution has been adopted by many others, such as Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 29 and Clemen, pp. 44-45.

[75] Hos. 5:1 and Deut. 33:18-19.

XUM

According to Eissfeldt, the information Philo supplies about these four gods goes back to the eleventh century B.C., and Philo's sources for this passage must have been that old.[76] Eissfeldt has no important evidence for this conclusion and at least one of the gods, Zeus Kassios or Baal Zaphon was worshiped down to the Roman period.

Philo concludes his reference to the mortal giants in 808:8-9. Their sons, he says, called themselves after their mothers, that is, did not know who their fathers were. The children were ignorant of their paternity because their mothers "united freely with anyone upon whom they chanced." This connects Philo's story with the Jewish legends of the fallen angels.

These legends are an expansion of the fragment of myth[77] narrated in Gen. 6:1-4. Verse 3, whose words are obscure,[78] is difficult. The other verses are reasonably clear, but tell only part of what must have been a longer story of the union of divine beings or minor gods, בני האלהים in the Hebrew, with human women. The Nephilim, famous heroes or giants,[79] were born of these unions. Jewish legend understood the בני האלהים as angels and retold the story accordingly.[80] The angels, under the leadership of Shemhazai, were attracted by the lewd practices, beauty and sensual charm of human women.[81] Two hundred angels descended to Mt. Hermon and swore to cooperate in choosing human

---

[76] Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 38.

[77] Even Cassuto, *Adam*, pp. 199-206 must admit this.

[78] See Orlinsky, *New Translation*, p. 72.

[79] See Num. 13:33.

[80] See Hexapla *ad*. Gen. 6:1.

[81] See PRE 22, and Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, p. 151.

XUM

wives for themselves. Giants resulted from these unions. The fallen angels then taught mankind all sorts of evil practices, from the use of weapons and cosmetics to exorcism, magic, and divination.[82]

These Biblical and Jewish legends are relics of Canaanite myth. Spiegel has pointed to the appearance of Danel, the hero of the Ugaritic epic, in the list of the angels. In addition, one of the skills the angels teach mankind is how to dye clothing, a reference to the chief industry of Phoenicia. Finally, as will be clearer below, others of the fallen angels can be identified as Canaanite or Phoenician gods.[83] It would seem that Jewish legend has transformed stories about heroes and gods into tales about angels.[84]

Philo's account of the mortal giants is similar to these Jewish and Biblical stories. Giants, sexual relations with women, and Mt. Hermon appear in both. Some details differ: thus Philo's giants unite *en passant* with the women while in Jewish legend the giants are born from marriages with women. But the similarities and the Canaanite elements in the Jewish legends indicate some affinity between the legends and Philo's account. It is impossible to use the two versions to reconstruct the hypothetical original, if there ever was one common original, but the two versions must be crystallizations of the same cycle of stories, with each version modifying that cycle to suit its own assumptions and beliefs. The original cycle must have spoken of gods or heroes whom Philo has Euhemerized and the Jewish legends transformed into angels.[85]

---

[82] Enoch, Chapters 6-8 and Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, pp. 124-125.

[83] Spiegel,"NDJ," pp. 336-341. See also Gordon, *UT*, # 719, p. 388.

[84] Spiegel, "NDJ," p. 354. See also Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 5, p. 152, n. 56.

Eissfeldt has plausibly suggested that another, fainter, echo of this cycle of stories may be preserved in Nonnus, Dionysiaca 40, 535-575. The ancestors of the Tyrians, from the race of giants, unite with the maiden fountains into whom unreasoning Eros has planted the shafts of love. The similarities to Philo are admittedly few and imprecise, but Nonnus has preserved vague recollections of too much Phoenician mythology in the "Phoenician books" of the Dionysiaca for the similarities to be coincidental.[86] Finally, Nonnus' myth is obviously of Tyrian provenance. This section of Philo's fragments, as will become clearer below, is also of Tyrian origin. Any similarities between Philo and Nonnus are therefore highly significant.

It should be noted that after these mountain giants the formal aspect of the text changes from a list of parents and children to one of notable members of families, the families being identified by their male ancestors. Individuals are not specified as the (immediate) children but as the (more or less) remote descendants of their predecessors. This change in type of genealogy almost certainly reflects a change in the type of source and suggests that here Philo went over from originally cosmogonic myths to a list of culture heroes (ex-deities). That is, the fragments discussed in this chapter, as they now stand, seem wholly concerned with mortal humans and their inventions. We have seen, however, that the originals of Kolpia, Baau, Aion, Protogonos, and perhaps Genos and Genea must have been cosmogonic. They have been adapted to their new context through the mention of Aion's discovery of food or Genos and Genea's discovery of prayer. Nevertheless, the originals must have been figures of cosmogony. The balance of the fragments to be discussed in this chapter are a true list of culture heroes (ex-deities). At some point Philo must have shifted from an originally cosmogonic source to the list. The change in type of genealogy here suggests that this was the point, and this is confirmed by the change in the character of most of the "persons" of the genealogy, from cosmic elements to individuals. It should be noted, however, that Philo may have found the cosmogony and the list of culture heroes already connected in his immediate source. In fact it is likely that he did so, as that would explain why he transformed the cosmogonic section to a list of culture heroes. We may suppose that every Phoenician city, not to say, temple, had its own mythology, beginning with a cosmogony and theogony and going on to local heroes, of whom many will have been connected with cultural innovations. When Sanchuniathon (or Philo) came to put these lists together he found an embarrassing wealth of cosmogonies. He used the verse text above, but then, when he found another at the beginning of the present mythology (probably Tyrian, see below) he felt that two different accounts of the origin of everything would be de trop. He didn't want to drop the cosmogonic part of the second account--it must have been an important element in a fixed structure. Therefore he tried to cut it down into an account of men and their inventions. Compare the similar solution of much the same problem by the editor of Genesis 1 and 2.[87]

---

[85] I am not the first to have seen this, see n. 58.

[86] Eissfeldt, RS, pp. 133-134.

---

[87] I owe this interpretation to a suggestion of Professor Morton Smith.

808:7-9 *ek toutōn - entychoien*.

The birth and parentage of Samemroumos and Ousoos are described in these lines. Philo's statement that "they called themselves after their mothers" need not mean that they had female names, but merely that they used matronyms instead of the patronyms customary in Greek and Semitic usage, i.e. they would identify themselves as τῆς + mother's name rather than τοῦ + father's name. (So ישו בר מרים, not בן יוסף.)

The correct reading of the first name is Samemroumos and not Memroumos.[88] Samemroumos is a transliteration of שמם רמם in Hebrew and Phoenician and is perfectly translated by *Hypsouranios*. The name means "High heaven." The name of his brother Ousoos must be introduced by emendation as it has fallen out of the MSS., but the emendation is certain.[89]

The Phoenician phrase שמם רמם appears in one Sidonian inscription where the context demands that it be the name of part of Greater Sidon.[90] A related phrase שממאדרם appears in another Sidonian inscription where the context makes similar demands.[91] While the interpretation of these words as names of districts has been disputed,[92] no other interpretation proposed fits the context as well. We shall therefore suppose that Samemroumos in Philo goes back to the district of Sidon

---

[88] Cf. Williams, p. 159.

[89] The emendation was first proposed by Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 818, n. 5.

[90] KAI 15, the inscription of Bodashtart of Sidon. For a recent discussion of the date of this inscription see Peckham, *Development*, pp. 77-87.

[91] KAI 14, lines 16 & 17.

[92] See KAI Vol. 2, p. 22, and Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 36. See also Teixidor, BES 1969, p. 332.

XUM

called שמם רמם. Eissfeldt has maintained that Phoenician place names were consistently feminine.[93] If so, this might explain Philo's statement that Samemroumos took his name from his mother, but the form and customary gender of both elements of שמם רמם are masculine.

Samemroumos or שמם רמם also appears in a totally different context, in an epithet of the goddess Anat. She is described in a recently published Ugaritic text as *b^{c}lt šmm rmm*, "Lady of the High Heavens."[94] If שמם רמם was used only in titles of goddesses Philo's statement that the name was taken from a female would be confirmed in another sense. Given the common pairing of deities in the area, however, it would seem likely that there was a בעל שמם רמם to match the בעלת. If so Philo's statement probably indicates that the goddess was by far the more important figure of the pair.[95]

The second brother, Ousoos, was originally identified with Biblical Eṣau,[96] an identification which seemed appropriate because the names were similar; both were hunters (808:12 and Gen. 25:27), and each had a brother who dwelt in or invented shelters (Gen. 25:27) and with whom he quarreled. Ousoos is also now identified as a section of Tyre, called Uzu in Egyptian and Babylonian documents.[97] Uzu is the section the Greeks called Palaityros or Old Tyre, the mainland coast facing the island city. Once again, if place names are feminine in Phoenician Philo's statement of the feminine origin of the names will be confirmed; and perhaps Philo's male Samemroumos and Ousoos are the Baals of places bearing those names (in Sidon and Tyre respectively, one would assume).[98]

---

[93] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 63f.

[94] RS 24.252, line 7 = *Ugaritica* V, p. 553.

[95] Cf. Baalat Gebal, the "Lady of Byblos." Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," p. 8 suggests that Samemroumos is the Baalshamin of Tyre. The Tyrian connections of Samemroumos will be discussed below. What I cannot comprehend is on what evidence Samemroumos is made into a Baalshamin.

[96] Scaliger *ap.* Orelli, p. 17, n. 26. Since Ousoos may be connected with Esau it would be interesting if some connection between Jacob and Samemroumos could be established. While there is no such direct connection it should be noted that Jacob was considered a god by the authors of *PGM*. See *PGM* III, 71*, 77*; XXXVI, 12-22; IV, 2223ff.; XII, 370f., 445ff., 466f. There are numerous similar passages in *PGM*. See Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 5, pp. 290-291.

808:10-11 *eita - papyrou*

As will be clearer below, Samemroumos=Hypsouranios and Ousoos were rivals, a rivalry which must reflect the conflicts of the places with which their names are associated. Thus far, the assumption is that Samemroumos=Hypsouranios stands for a section of Sidon, but the statement that Hypsouranios lived at Tyre (*oikēsai*) is difficult to explain on that assumption. Perhaps it means that in those days *even* Hypsouranios-Samemroumos of Sidon lived at Tyre, but this is not what one expects here. In a context of culture-heroes *oikēsai* should mean "settle" or "found" as in 807:22 above. Samemroumos=Hypsouranios must somehow be a Tyrian, not a Sidonian. We may suppose there was a section of Tyre called שמם רמם, a name which came from an epithet of the deity worshiped there. The deity and quarter of town in Tyre, otherwise unknown, would be similar to the attested ones in Sidon. The rivalry below between Samemroumos=Hypsouranios and Ousoos would therefore be between two sections of Tyre, not between Sidon and Tyre.

---

[97] See the lists of Egyptian conquests, *ANET*, p. 243 and the annals of Sennacherib, *ANET*, p. 287. Cheyne, "Esau and Usoos," p. 189 was the first to see the relevance of these documents to Philo.

[98] Cf. Clemen, p. 47. Eusebius, *De Laud Const*. 13 equated Usoros and Melqart.

The discoveries in this section follow a reasonably evolutionary pattern. Aion discovers food from trees; Genos and Genea, Phoenicia and prayer; Phos, Pyr, and Phlox fire; Hypsouranios builds the simple, primitive shelter from reeds, rushes, and papyrus. As Clemen and Williams have noted,[99] the details of this last discovery are somewhat perplexing. Reeds, rushes, and papyrus all suggest an Egyptian rather than a Phoenician setting. The difficulty, however, is only apparent as papyrus grew in marshes outside Egypt,[100] and therefore might have grown near Tyre.[101]

808:11 stasiasai - Ousoon.

The rivalry of Samemroumos=Hypsouranios is here explicitly mentioned. Eissfeldt takes the two names as representing Sidon and Tyre respectively and interprets the reference to the rivalry as a reference to the long history of conflict between Sidon and Tyre for the dominant position in Phoenician affairs.[102] By the Hellenistic period this conflict had become a debate over which city had been the common original settlement, the mother city of the area, with both Tyrian and Sidonian coins claiming that their city had been the one.[103] In Philo's account, according to Eissfeldt, the conflict of the cities has become that of the brothers Sameroumos=Hypsouranios and Ousoos; their quarrel is the beginning of the disputes of the cities.

---

[99] Williams, p. 160; Clemen, pp. 45-46. See also D.S. 1,43,4.

[100] See Theophrastus, HP 4,8,4; Cf. 9,7,1. See also Pliny NH 13,73.

[101] There is a swamp near Tyre on the map in Eissfeldt, "Tyros," cols. 1877-1878. There was another swamp near Haifa, not to speak of the Huleh.

[102] Eissfeldt, RS, pp. 62-67.

[103] See Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Sidon, numbers 87-91 and p. cxxxiii.

XUM

Eissfeldt's interpretation is not, however, acceptable. We have seen that Samemroumos=Hypsouranios does not stand for a section of Sidon but of Tyre. Moreover, the conflict of Sidon and Tyre was so important that it should not be represented by the extremely minor--almost totally insignificant--conflict of Samemroumos=Hypsouranios and Ousoos in the fragments. For both these reasons the conflict more probably reflects one between two sections of Tyre.

Where in Tyre might Samemroumos=Hypsouranios be located? Since Ousoos is associated with the mainland Samemroumos=Hypsouranios might represent the island part of the city. If this is so the conflict between the brothers might then be between the islanders and mainlanders. Samemroumos=Hypsouranios (the islanders) according to Philo invented shelters, while Ousoos (representing the mainlanders) was a hunter. This fact may allow a further hypothesis. Perhaps the conflict was between the sedentary islanders and the more nomadic hunters on the mainland. The conflict in the fragments would then reflect the very ancient theme of the conflict between nomadic and sedentary types (a conflict remotely reflected in the Biblical stories of Jacob and Esau).[104] Finally, if this is the true explanation of the fragments the relative insignificance of the conflict is also understandable. The rivalry would not be the important dispute between Sidon and Tyre but local.

Whatever the interpretation one important conclusion is apparent: Philo's story is Tyrian. If the conflict is between Sidon and Tyre the latter has primacy; if between two sections of Tyre, Tyre is the setting. It is therefore likely that Philo's sources for this story are Tyrian.

---

[104] See Wellhausen, Prolegomena, pp. 320-323.

We have seen above that there are similarities between Philo's account of the giants and Tyrian mythology preserved by Nonnus. The idea that Philo derived all the material in this section of the fragments from Tyrian sources is at least a plausible hypothesis.

808:11-15 *hos - embēnai*.

Two discoveries are attributed to Ousoos: clothing made from animal skins and the first boat, or more properly dugout. This combination of discoveries has caused Eissfeldt, Lokkegaard and other scholars to conclude that Ousoos was the craftsman god of Tyre, whose name was a transliteration of Ugaritic *ḫss*.[105] This explanation emphasizes the second of Ousoos' discoveries and pays less attention to the first. Jewish legend suggests another explanation of Ousoos' function, an explanation which admittedly emphasizes the first of his discoveries at the expense of the second.

Jewish legends tell of the pair of fallen angels 𐡏𐡅𐡆𐡀 and 𐡏𐡆𐡀𐡋.[106] Since Jewish angels, as we have seen above, may be metamorphoses of Canaanite gods or heroes, there may have been one god or hero called 𐡏𐡅𐡆𐡀; Philo's Ousoos could then refer to the same personality.[107] This argument can be taken a step further. After the punishment of the angels Azael supposedly continued to sin and to entice women with his devilish dyes and feminine finery בבגדי צבעונים של נשים.[108] Azael of the legends is thus involved in making clothing, much like our Ousoos, although Ousoos makes his clothing from skins while Azael is a dyer. I therefore suggest that Philo and the Jewish legends are discussing the same figure, the god associated with the skills used to make clothing. This god may also have been the Baal of the place in Tyre called Uzu, as was discussed above. All these aspects of the god would unite beautifully if there were some evidence that Old Tyre was at some time the center of the clothing industry. Unfortunately I can find none. Heaps of murex shells, for example, are found up and down the entire Phoenician coast, on the island part of Tyre, as well as on the mainland.[109] Admittedly, this explanation disregards the invention of the dugout. Perhaps this is because Philo (or his source) has combined several different myths. One told of Samemroumos=Hypsouranios' settlement of Tyre; the second of the conflict of Samemroumos and of Ousoos and of their contrasting inventions, Samemroumos=Hypsouranios - fixed shelters, Ousoos - portable shelter and clothing. The attribution of a dugout to Ousoos might be part of a third, originally unrelated, myth which told of his discovery of ships, sailing, stelai, sacrifices, etc.[110]

---

[105] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 39; Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 60; Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," pp. 18-22. These scholars must assume that the craftsman functions have been split among several gods, a not unlikely assumption. See pp. 202-203.

[106] TB Yoma 67b.

[107] See n. 85. 𐡏𐡆𐡀𐡋 is formed, like many names of angels, by adding 𐡀𐡋 to 𐡏𐡅𐡆𐡀. There thus may be a single antecedent of both 𐡏𐡅𐡆𐡀 and 𐡏𐡆𐡀𐡋.

---

[108] Yalkut Gen. 44, cited by Spiegel, "NDJ," p. 352.

[109] See Jensen, "Royal Purple," p. 106.

[110] I owe this interpretation to a suggestion of Professor Morton Smith. The tradition which attributes sailing to Ousoos is unclear on another point: where did he sail from and where did he sail to. From the description in Philo it seems that he left the island part of Tyre and then returned there to set up the two stelai. Will, "Sanctuaire d'Heracles," pp. 7-11 has suggested that representations of this first voyage may be preserved on third century Tyrian coins, such as Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Pl. XLIV, 6.

808:15-19 anierōsai - etos.

After his successful voyage Ousoos consecrated two stelai to Fire and Wind, presumably as the two gods who had made the voyage possible. When Ousoos and his brother died they were deified by their descendants. The beliefs and practices of Ousoos and his posterity thus conform to Philo's theories (805:25ff.). The two stelai consecrated by Ousoos are probably represented on Tyrian coins of the third century A.D., in some cases with the legend "Ambrosial Rocks."[111] (Nonnus speaks of the "Ambrosial Rocks in other terms, almost as forming the rocks of the island of Tyre;[112] evidently the legend circulated in various forms, but the official version will have been that represented by the coins on which the rocks clearly appear as stelai or baetyls.)[113] Ousoos' stelai are presumably also to be identified with the two stelai Herodotus claimed to have seen in the temple of "Herakles" at Tyre, though Herodotus' report makes one golden.[114]

808:19-21 chronois - etos.

Agreus, hunter and Halieus, fisherman are the next pair, born from the family of Hypsouranios. Their inventions were indicated by their names. Some scholars doubt whether there were gods with these names or whether they are fictions invented by Philo to suit the inventions.[115] We possess enough evidence, at least for Agreus, to answer this question decisively. Agreus would probably be צד in Phoenician,[116] and there is an attested Phoenician name צדיתן.[117] On analogy with well-known names such as בעליתן or סבניתן, צד must be the name of a god,[118] the god of hunting. There is no evidence of a god of fishing named Halieus or the equivalent in Phoenician. A mosaic at Antioch, however, portrays with Nereids a horned Triton identified as Agreus (which can mean "fisherman"in Greek).[119] This mosaic may therefore refer to Philo's Halieus.

---

[111] Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Tyre, # 427,429-430 and Pl. XXXIII, 13, 14 & 15; XLIV, 7.

[112] Nonnus, Dionysiaca, 40,429-534.

[113] Cf. Milik, "Cultes," p. 574.

[114] Hdt. 2,44. Bochart, p. 24 was the first to notice this point.

808:21-24 _ex hōn - pleusai_.

The correct reading of the name of the "inventor" is Chousor.[120] The identity of this character was not well understood before the discovery of the Ugaritic epics and was one of the first enigmas in Philo to be resolved by the Ugaritic documents.[121] Philo's Chousor, the iron worker, identified with Hephaistos, is the Ugaritic craftsman god _kṯr wḫss_. Philo's figure and the god of the Ugaritic epics are identical in function except that the Ugaritic god does not perform magical acts in the epics; magical acts, in the epics, are only performed once and then by El.[122] Gaster resolved this difficulty in anthropological and philological terms by pointing to the numerous instances where crafts and magic are the function of one god or group of gods. In Greece, for example, there are the Daktyloi who are both magicians and craftsmen.[123] This evidence can now be supplemented with proof from Ras Shamra itself: several Ugaritic texts identify corresponding Ugaritic and Akkadian gods. In one of these Chousor is equated with Ea.[124] Ea is the god of magic in Mesopotamia.

---

[115] Williams, p. 161 believes that Agreus and Alieus were fictions. The problem is similar to that of Phos, Pyr, and Phlox discussed above, p. 182.

[116] This equation was first proposed by Scaliger, p. 35.

[117] CIS I, 102=KAI 49, line 34. His father's name was גרצד which also indicates that צד was a god.

[118] See KAI Vol. 2, p. 67 and Clemen, p. 48; also Teixidor BES 1967, #64, pp. 179-80.

[119] IGLS, 751.

[120] Cf. Williams, pp. 161-2 who has some doubts.

[121] See Meyer, _GdA_, Vol. II,2 p. 180, n. 5. Cf. Eissfeldt, _RS_, pp. 28-29.

Chousor's invention of the raft can be seen as an advance on the invention of Ousoos, the single log or dugout. Ousoos was the first to venture onto the sea, but Chousor discovered sailing. Thus there seems to be no contradiction and no need here to assume that Philo has combined different sources, though he may have.[125] Yet later the Kabeiroi were the first to invent a (shaped?) boat (809:12). Again, Philo may have intended the discoverable distinctions, or may have carelessly combined his sources.[126]

Scholars were so excited by the discovery of Chousor's origin that they concluded that Philo's sources must somehow be as old as the Ugaritic poems, and date from some time before 1200 B.C.[127] Alas,

---

[122] Gordon, UT, 126:V:35. Cf. Ibid. #1325, pp. 424-5.

[123] See Gaster, Thespis, pp. 161-163. On the Daktyloi see Rose, "Idaean Dactyls," p. 449.

[124] R.S. 20.24 line 15 = Ugaritica V, p. 51.

[125] This is Gruppe's position. Gruppe, pp. 376ff.

[126] See Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," p. 457; Clemen, pp. 56ff. & Williams, p. 161.

[127] See Eissfeldt, RS, p. 58.

XUM

Ugaritic kṯr wḫss was of the bronze age. The metals he works are gold and silver; iron is never mentioned.[128] Philo's Chousor, as represented in the fragments, works only with iron. Thus Philo's sources were at least reworked in the iron age. The comparison between Philo's Chousor and his Ugaritic counterpart indicates the gap between the two sets of documents rather than their contemporaneity.[129]

808:24-25 dio kai - Meilichion.

The attributes of Zeus Meilichios seem inappropriate to Chousor, as Ewald noted.[130] Ewald therefore proposed that this phrase was a transliteration and translation of the Phoenician אל מליח. This would fit the context better as מליח would allude to Chousor's connection with sailors (מלח) and hence to his discovery of the light boat. If some connection could be established between Chousor and the Pataikoi (the dwarf protective images of Phoenician ships according to Herodotus 3,37), Ewald's conclusions would be much more attractive.[131] There is, however, no proof of that connection and Ewald's proposal necessitates our making the difficult assumption that Philo understood Dia Meilichion as a combination of translation and transliteration. Finally, while

---

[128] Gordon, UT, 51:VI:30-40.

[129] A further transformation of Chousor can be seen in the cosmogony of Mochos, FGrH 784 F 4, in which he is the god of separation, who opens the cosmic egg. Given the possibility that Mochos may have been a Tyrian (see n. 30), his cosmogony might prove that Chousor was also worshiped at Tyre.

[130] Ewald, p. 18. Zeus Meilichios, "the kindly Zeus," (a euphemism) was an underworld power, giver of fertility and wealth, but also of punishment and death; he was often represented as a serpent and identified with Agathos Daimon. See Cook, Zeus, Vol. 2, pp. 1091-1160.

[131] Albright, "Dwarf Craftsmen," pp. 58-59 is inconclusive.

XUM

מלח meaning mariner may be attested,[132] the form מליח is unattested and unlikely in Phoenician, and would not yield the vowels of *Meilichios*, nor would it make good sense. For the "sailor god" one would expect אל מלח.

Lokkegaard has therefore attempted a totally different interpretation of the title, beginning with the assumption that Chousor is somehow aptly described as the benign or kindly god. Lokkegaard correctly realizes the extent of his problem and recognizes that it is El, not *kṯr wḫss* who is called the "Kindly One" in the Ugaritic epics (*ltpn il dpid*).[133] Nevertheless, Lokkegaard maintains that such an epithet might be thought applicable to Chousor because of Arabic *kawṯar* which means a hospitable man. The supposition that a root meaning first found in Arabic in the seventh century A.D. and later can safely be read into a Ugaritic name of the fourteenth century B.C. is not very likely. Moreover, *kawṯar* may not mean a liberal or hospitable man,[134] and even if it did there is a gap between a hospitable man and a kindly god. The likelihood is that Chousor and Zeus Meilichios were connected as givers of wealth - a major function of Agathos Daimon and of skilled industry. The *trait d'union* is therefore probably Greek Hephaistos.[135]

808:25 *hoi de - ek plinthōn*.

This passage is confusing. Chousor supposedly has brothers yet all the other inventors discussed were in pairs. Clemen and others were so disturbed by this departure from the norm that they emended *tous adelphous* to the singular *ton adelphon*, thus making this case conform to the others.[136] If we possessed the full text of the *Phoenician History* this difficulty might be resolved.

---

[132] Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. מלח , p. 117.

[133] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 61, especially n. 3.

[134] I owe this information to Dr. Held.

[135] On Agathos Daimon and wealth see above n. 130. I owe this interpretation to a suggestion of Professor Morton Smith.

Whatever the case, the invention ascribed to Chousor's brothers is a continuation of the functions of Ugaritic *kṯr wḫss*. The brothers discover how to build walls of bricks; in the Ugaritic epics *kṯr wḫss* is the divine architect who builds the palace of Baal.[137]

808:26-809:1 *meta tauta-exeuron*.

The next generation of discoverers were also craftsmen. Philo's text attributes to them the discoveries of the use of chaff in brick making, of drying bricks in the sun, and of how to build roofs.[138] The name of one, Technites, is the common Greek word for artisan, and therefore appropriate. The other, Geinos Autochthon, poses something of a problem as his name means earthborn native and seems more appropriate to a cosmogony than to a list of inventors. Perhaps, as Lokkegaard suggests, he is the first scientific farmer.[139]

There is a proliferation of craftsmen gods in Philo: Chousor, his brothers, Geinos, and Technites. The technical functions seemingly held by *kṯr wḫss* alone in the Ugaritic epics have been split up among many.[140] Lokkegaard believes that this division of functions is a sign of the advances in culture between Ugarit and Philo's day. The more advanced culture, with more specialized skills, requires a comparable specialization of gods or inventors. Another explanation, rather complementary than alternative, can be offered. Ugaritic, as Lokkegaard realized, contains numerous gods with two or more names. The craftsman god is called *ktr whss*, Sir Adroit and Cunning, in Gaster's apt translation.[141] Another name for the same god is *Hyn*, the expert or understanding one.[142] Modern scholars were confused at first by this profusion of names and divided this one god into three separate deities.[143] Might not Philo or his sources have been similarly confused? It is also possible that Greek mythology might have exercised a direct influence here. Lagrange points to the Athenian tradition of the several sons of Hephaistos, one of whom is Erichthonios described by Euripides as *Gēgenēs*.[144] Perhaps these sons of Hephaistos, one of whom is an earth-born native, were responsible for Philo's traditions of Hephaistos=Chousor's brothers.[145]

---

[136] Clemen, p. 50.

[137] Gordon, *UT*, 51:VI: entire column. The brick walls built might more properly be rendered as stone walls, or walls made of blocks of stone in order to avoid a contradiction with the invention of bricks made of straw below. See Spiegel, "NDJ," p. 344, n. 13.

[138] See the preceding note. Accepting that interpretation one is not obliged here to search for evidence of brick making without straw. Cf. Exod. 5:8.

[139] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 62.

809:1-6 *apo toutōn - kalountai*.

Agros and Hero of Agros (or "of the field") or Agrotes are

---

[140] *Ibid*. [141] Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 161.

[142] See e.g. Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 163.

[143] See e.g. Virolleaud, "Nouveau Chant," p. 117.

[144] Eur. *Ion*, 20. Lagrange, p. 375.

[145] Clemen, p. 52 rejects this interpretation on trivial grounds, based upon his determination to derive the whole structure from unknown Phoenician antecedents, without any substantial Greek accretions. But Greek--especially Athenian--mythology is likely to have exercised a strong influence on Phoenicia, and had half a millenium before Philo's time in which to do it.

XUM

usually understood as related to agriculture and the fields, as their names suggest. Applying the principle established at the beginning of the chapter they must have been gods of the field for a non-Euhemerist. In Phoenician one of their names might have been 𐤔𐤃.[146] Baal Sadeh ("Beelseddi") is known from a latin inscription, in which he is identified with Jupiter.[147] This god must have been quite important to the people who erected the inscription, as they identified him with Jupiter. Perhaps they shared the veneration of the Byblians. Representations of this god may be preserved in a mosaic found at Antioch and a sculptured base from Mariut in Egypt. The cultivated fields are personified and identified as Agros.[148] It is uncertain, however, whether the mosaic was intended as a portrait of gods or as an allegory; similarly the base. Agros is accompanied on the mosaic by Oinos and Opora, on the base by Prochreia and Geouchia, suggesting that allegory was intended. Such allegorization, however, may help explain Philo's choice of the Greek name for the deity.

Lokkegaard has recently suggested that Agros in Philo may not be part of the context of agricultural gods but may be a transliteration of the Ugaritic god _Ugr_ one of Baal's messengers.[149] _Ugr_'s name would have entered because his name sounded like that of the agricultural gods. But all the discoverers in this section of the fragments come in pairs, and unless there is some overwhelming difficulty, there is no reason to suppose that one of the members of a pair has been misplaced because of the sound of his name. Thus here there is no reason to suppose that Agros in this context has anything to do with Baal's messenger.[150]

---

[146] First suggested by Ewald, p. 19.

[147] IGLS 2925 from Timna on the west side of the Beqa.

[148] IGLS 1011. Morey, _Mosaics_, p. 33; the base is now in Alexandria. See Breccia, _Musée Greco-Romain_, pp. 57f. and pl. XXXVI, n. 126.

[149] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 62.

The Byblians worship Agrotes or Hero of Agros as a god. His shrine is drawn by a pair of oxen. This shrine has been identified by Du Mesnil du Buisson as the shrine of Jupiter Heliopolitanus which is also represented as drawn by a pair of animals.[151] Philo, according to Du Mesnil du Buisson, was supposedly describing the Jupiter of Baalbek and even when Philo says that this god is especially worshiped by the Byblians he is still referring to that god. Byblians stands for Phoenicians.[152] These references to Baalbek are supposedly confirmed by the description of the inventions. One of the inventions is of cellars, which Du Mesnil du Buisson sees as referring to the vast underground storage areas at Baalbek which, according to him, were sometimes used for rituals.[153]

Du Mesnil du Buisson, I believe, was partially correct: Philo's Agrotes was represented much like Jupiter Heliopolitanus. But Philo is quite specific in stating that he is discussing a Byblian god so the reference to Jupiter Heliopolitanus is unlikely. The inventions--courtyards, fences, cellars--are all the last stages in the perfection of a house and the context suggests that ordinary cellars are intended not huge underground chambers like those at Baalbek.

---

[150] Philo's Agros may shed some light on a well-known difficulty in the Sidonian inscription of Bodashtart (KAI 15). Eshmun is described in that inscription as שד/ר קדש. It is difficult to be certain which letter is intended because the orthography of the period barely distinguished between r and d (See Peckham, Development, pp. 89-90.) The reading šr had the virtue of making some sense while šd made little or none. See KAI Vol. 2, p. 24 and Teixidor BES 1969, p. 326. Philo's Agros, however, suggests that the latter reading may be plausible. Eshmun is one of the divine guarantors of the Baalu treaty. He is called upon to punish the treaty-breaker with destruction, capture, and lack of food, clothing and oil (line 10). These punishments are all appropriate to a god called šd qdš. Philo's Agros is not Eshmun, who appears independently below. Rather, he suggests that such gods of the fields were worshiped by Phoenicians of Philo's day.

[151] Du Mesnil du Buisson, Etudes, p. 48.

[152] Ibid., p. 51. [153] Ibid.

The discussion of Agros and Agrotes or Hero of Agros thus far has been based on the assumption that they were related to the fields. This assumption, however, is weakened by the statement that this pair were the ancestors of ordinary hunters and of those who use dogs in hunting. Perhaps the names Agros and Agrotes were derived from the Greek word for hunting agra. Another difficulty is that Philo here repeats a discovery, since hunting has already been attributed to Agreus in 808:20. These difficulties stand as testimonies to our incomplete understanding of the text, partly, no doubt, because of its fragmentary character.[154]

The final sentence of the passage may be a clue to the complex identity of Agros and Agrotes or Hero of Agros. The identification with the wanderers or Titans was already understood by Bunsen as suggesting some connection between Agros and Agrotes and the נפילים.[155] If such figures existed in the Phoenician world they would connect this part of the discovery section with the story of Sons of Gods or fallen angels. Bunsen's suggestion can be amplified in another sense. We now know of a group of Ugaritic deities called the רפאים. These gods, much like Greek Titans,[156] are gods of the earth. A recently published

---

[154] Cf. Lagrange, p. 376. [155] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 824, n. 1.

[156] Rose, Handbook, pp. 21-22.

XUM

text establishes that the רפאים were also charioteers.[157] An attractive if unprovable assumption would be to give the רפאים a third function--hunting.[158] If the רפאים could be demonstrated to control hunting and to be earth gods, one of the obscurities in the fragments might be solved.

809:6-7 *apo toutōn - poimnas*.

Amunos and Magos introduce villages and flocks, another advance in the material civilization. Their names have not been successfully explained.[159] Lokkegaard proposed that Amunos might be a transliteration of *amin*, the trustworthy one or נאמן in Hebrew, and might allude to the well fortified Syrian towns he founded.[160] This explanation is rather far fetched. I believe it more prudent to admit ignorance. About Magos admission of ignorance is inescapable.[161]

809:7-9 *apo toutōn - heuron*.

Philo's Misor and Sydyk are transliterations of מישר and צדק in Hebrew or Phoenician respectively.[162] In both Hebrew and Phoenician these two words form a pair and Philo has properly associated them.[163]

---

[157] Margulis, "Ugaritic Psalm," pp. 299-302. Rephaim is also one of the names of the descendants of the fallen angels. See Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, p. 151.

[158] One of the names of the descendants of fallen angels is גבורים, Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, p. 151, and at least one of the גבורים, Nimrod, was a famous hunter, Gen. 10:8-9.

[159] See Orelli, p. 22, n. 46 and Clemen, pp. 54-55.

[160] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 63.

[161] *Ibid.*, p. 63, n. 6. Lokkegaard suggests that Magos might have something to do with Arabic *mǵy* meaning to traverse a region, but this meaning is irrelevant to the context.

[162] Cf. Meyer, *GdA*, Vol. 2,2, p. 162.

[163] ✓ *ysr*//*ṣdq*: KAI 4, lines 6 & 7; Gordon *UT*, # 2147, pp. 472-3; Deut.

Philo has rendered each of the Phoenician words in Greek; Misor as eulyton or easily solved, Sydyk as dikaion or just. The second of these translations is perfect but the first is not apt, even if it gives a possible Greek equivalent for מישר.[164] When associated with צדק in Hebrew or Phoenician מישר is equivalent and should have been rendered by a synonym of dikaion. Philo has chosen a more circuitous translation. When legal problems are straightforward (a possible sense of מישר) they are easily solved (eu-luō) and justice results. Philo or his source may have been playing with etymologies, and if Philo is responsible it would imply that he had a fair knowledge of Phoenician grammar and syntax, even if he did not choose to use words in their most obvious senses.[165] But if so, why he chose a circuitous translation is unanswered.[166]

Misor and Sydyk are clearly the Phoenician equivalents of ~~the~~ pair of Babylonian gods Mesharu and Kittum,[167] two gods associated with Shamash and part of his retinue.[168] The solar associations of צדק or Sydyk may be behind the phrase שמש צדקה in Mal. 3:20. (A fuller discussion of these points is best deferred until the passage discussing Asklepios=Eshmun as Sydyk's son, 811:4-5 and 813:2.) Hence

---

32:4. There is another group of parallelisms in the Bible מישר // צדק, as in Prov. 8:6 and Isa. 11:4.

[164] The difficulty in the rendering of Misor was first noticed by Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 825, n. 13.

[165] Cf. Williams, pp. 31-32.

[166] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 825, n. 13 suggests that Philo might have chosen this translation because he was thinking of Aramaic שרא.

[167] First pointed out by Clemen, p. 55.

[168] See Contenau, Everyday Life, pp. 249-250.

XUM

we may expect to find evidence of the worship of Canaanite or Phoenician gods called Misor and Sydyk. The evidence for the worship of a god צדק has been much disputed.[169] Teixidor has published an Aramaic papyrus which may solve the problem as it contains the personal name עבדצדק.[170] Such a name would establish beyond doubt the divinity of צדק.[171]

Misor and Sydyk discover the use of salt. This discovery has usually been explained by reference to the Biblical verses associating salt with a covenant. Misor and Sydyk are understood as gods related to covenants, and salt is therefore an appropriate discovery.[172] I would be happier with an explanation which stressed the solar connections of Misor and Sydyk more directly, even if I cannot offer one.

808:9-11 apo Misor - ekalesan.

Misor's son Taautos and his invention have been discussed at length in Chapter Five, pp. 77-86. Taautos' invention, writing, is here explicitly described as alphabetic.[173]

808:11-12 ek de tou Sydyk - heuron

From the perspective of Greek mythology Philo has properly

---

[169] See BDB p. 841 s.v. צדק. The same suggestion has recently been made by Rosenberg, "Ṣedeq," pp. 161-177.

[170] See Teixidor, "Nouveau Papyrus," p. 285 line 3 and pp. 289-290.

[171] Cf. other עבד names, Harris, Grammar, pp. 129-130. Naveh, "Aramaica Dubiosa," pp. 321-325 thinks the papyrus is a forgery. If so the most decisive evidence for a god צדק would disappear. Teixidor informs me that he has answered Naveh in an article to appear in JNES.

[172] The passage was thus explained by Gruppe, p. 355, with whom Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 62-63 agrees. Cf. Clemen, pp. 55-56 who admits ignorance.

[173] Taautos' invention is both the first kind of writing and alphabetic.

XUM

associated the Dioskouroi with the invention of a boat. Williams has shown the aptness of Philo's text by pointing to the Dioskouroi as patrons of the mariners in Greek mythology.[174]

Philo has equated four sets of gods, Dioskouroi, Kabeiroi, Korybants, and Samothracians. The identification of Kabeiroi with Samothracians is not particularly instructive since the Kabeiroi could always be called by that name. A major center of their worship was Samothrace.[175] The equation of Kabeiroi with Dioskouroi is probably due to their both being gods of mariners.[176] The final identification, that of Korybants, is characteristic of the Hellenistic period.[177] In any case when Philo next refers to the sons of Sydyk in 813:1 he simply calls them Kabeiroi.

809:12-13 ek toutōn - epōidas

The descendants of the Dioskouroi etc. seemingly made these first medical discoveries. Put another way, the inventors of these skills were Sydyk's grandchildren. This seems to contradict the statement in 813:1-2 which makes Asklepios Sydyk's son.[178] Either Philo or Eusebius was sloppy in his citation or we have here another indication that Philo used more than one source in preparing his Phoenician History.[179]

iv

As presented by Eusebius, undoubtedly following Philo, the fragments in this chapter commence where the cosmogony (discussed in the

---

[174] Williams, p. 167. See also Rose, Handbook, p. 230.

[175] See Guthrie, "Cabiri," p. 150. [176] Ibid. [177] Ibid.

[178] Cf. Williams, p. 167, who does not see a contradiction.

[179] See above, p. 199.

XUM

previous chapter) ended. The world and some animals already exist, the origin of human life is the next topic. We have seen however, that these fragments actually begin with another, independent cosmogony. Kolpia, Baau, Aion, Protogonos, Genos, Genea, the forms of fire and the mountain ranges were originally part of a cosmogonic tradition. After the mountain ranges Philo leaves cosmogonic traditions and begins to present material on culture heroes and their inventions, deities and their functions for a non-Euhemerist. This shift in content is confirmed by a shift in form of filiation.

In the previous chapter we had no clues of the provenance of the verse cosmogony. The material in this chapter, however, seems to come from Tyre. The cosmogonic portions are quite similar to the cosmogony ascribed to Mochos who may have been a Tyrian. The story of the giants has a faint echo in Tyrian mythology preserved by Nonnus, and the setting of the quarrel of Samemroumos and Ousoos is Tyre.

The Tyrian material upon which Philo or his source drew may not have been a single source. There are several repetitions and apparent contradictions even within the fragments discussed in this chapter. From this it would seem that Philo or his source, has not only compiled the traditions of various cities, but has also assembled the differing myths of each of the cities. On the other hand, the supposition that the cosmogonic section of this genealogy was known to Philo as part of the same documents as the genealogy of the culture heroes would help explain why Philo kept and partly made over the cosmogonic section.

The major purpose of the commentary, as outlined in the introduction, was to discover the gods behind Philo's"mortals" and the functions behind the "inventions." On the whole this purpose has been achieved. Virtually all the mortals emerge as Phoenician deities even when they are called by Greek name only--in most such cases the Phoenician original can be readily supplied. Even in the few cases where it was impossible to supply a Phoenician original this was probably due to lack of information, rather than the absence of such an original.

Finally, the date of the traditions preserved by Philo is certainly not in the second millenium B.C. Philo's Chousor works iron, as we have seen, excluding the possibility of a bronze age source. Some points in the fragments date to Philo's own day such as the equation of Baalshamem and the sun, while others may represent some direct Greek influence such as Geinos Autochthon. The conclusions of the previous chapters concerning the date of the material in Philo are therefore not contradicted. In fact whatever is datable confirms these conclusions.

XUM

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE LIFE OF KRONOS

i

The fragments to be discussed in this chapter center around Kronos. He is the main character in the events narrated and the section concludes with Eusebius' sneer at the insignificance of his life, and at the stories told about him by the Greeks (811:20-23). Since Bunsen, almost all commentators have realized that these passages form a distinct unit which differs from the sections which precede and follow.[1] Inventions may be mentioned in passing in this section (i.e. 810:5-7 and 810:28-29), but the fundamental concern is no longer to narrate the history of discoveries (as it was in the fragments considered in Chapter Seven).

Philo's Euhemerism, consistently applied in the fragments discussed in the previous chapter, is still apparent although less absolute. The section begins with a reminder that the actors were mortal: τις 'Ελιοῦν, a certain Elioun (809:14). There are some apparent lapses, such as *theous* in 810:22 and *theos Ouranos* in 810:29. Philo has also continued his usual practice of identifying equivalent Phoenician and

---

[1] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 827. Among more recent scholars see Clemen, p. 58, or Williams, p. 5. Bunsen also suggested that the original version of these stories might have been a cosmogonic myth; we would call it a cosmogony by succession.

XUM

Greek gods: El=Kronos (809:22); Melqart=Herakles (811:10-11). Thus even when Philo gives only the Greek name of a god it is possible if not likely that he is really thinking and writing about the Phoenician equivalent.

Kronos' adventures as told by Philo closely resemble the accounts of Greek mythology and of Hesiod in particular. Philo recognizes these similarities and has a theory of his own to explain them (813:4-22), a theory which is at the core of the scholarly debate concerning the fragments. I propose to note the similarities and differences between Philo and Hesiod in this chapter but to defer discussing their significance until the commentary on the passages in which Philo develops his theory.

ii

TRANSLATION OF TEXTS DISCUSSED

(809:14) At the same time as these [last] is born a certain Elioun, called Hypsistos and a female called Berouth, and they lived near Byblos. (809:15) From these is begotten Epigeios Autochthon, whom they later called Ouranos, so [beautiful] that from him the element above us, on account of its exceeding beauty, is also called Ouranos. (809:17) To him a sister is begotten of the above-mentioned parents and was correspondingly called Ge, and on account of [her] beauty, he says, they named the earth, which also bears this name, after her. (809:19) But their father Hypsistos, having died in an encounter with wild animals, was sanctified, and his children offered libations and sacrifices to him. (809:21) And Ouranos, succeeding to his father's sovereignty, takes his sister Ge to wife, and has four children by her:

El or Kronos, and Baitylos, and Dagon (who is Siton), and Atlas. (809:23) And Ouranos had many descendants from other wives. Therefore Ge, being angry and jealous, abused Ouranos [with the result] that they even were separated from each other. (809:25) And Ouranos, though he left her, coming to her by force whenever he wished and having sexual relations with her, would leave again. (810:1) And he also used to attempt to kill the children born from her. (810:2) But Ge defended herself many times, having found herself allies. (810:2) Then Kronos, advancing into manhood (using Hermes Trismegistos as adviser and ally--for he was Kronos' secretary) punishes his father Ouranos and avenges his mother. (810:5) To Kronos are born children--Persephone and Athena. (810:6) The former died a virgin. With the advice of Athena and Hermes, Kronos fashioned from iron a sickle and spear. (810:7) Then Hermes, speaking magical words to Kronos' allies, created in [them] the desire to fight against Ouranos on behalf of Ge. (810:9) And thus Kronos, meeting Ouranos in war, drove him out of power and succeeded to the kingship. (810:10) In the battle the beloved concubine of Ouranos was captured. [She] was pregnant, and Kronos gave her to Dagon for wife. (810:12) She gave birth at his home to the [child] which she bore from Ouranos and whom she called Demarous. (810:14) Following these [events] Kronos builds a wall around his dwelling and founds the first city in Phoenicia, Byblos. After this, Kronos, suspecting his own brother Atlas, on the advice of Hermes, throwing him into the depths of the earth, buried him. (810:16) At [about] this time the descendants of the Dioskouroi, having constructed rafts and boats, set sail and, cast ashore near Mt. Kassios, consecrated a shrine at that spot. (810:18) The allies of El [i.e.] of Kronos were nicknamed Elohim, as those called after Kronos might be called Kronioi. And Kronos had a son Sadidos whom, because he suspected him, he killed with his own iron [weapon] and deprived him of his life, becoming the executioner of his son. (810:21) Similarly, he also cut off the head of his own daughter, so that all the gods were panic stricken at Kronos' disposition. (810:23) Some time later, Ouranos, being in exile, sends his virgin daughter Astarte with two other of her sisters, Rhea and Dione, to destroy Kronos by treachery, and Kronos, having captured them, made them his wedded wives even though they were his sisters. (810:26) Ouranos, having learned this, sends Heimarmene and Horas together with other allies [to make war] against Kronos. (810:27) But Kronos won them over and kept them on his side. (810:28) And moreover, he says, the god Ouranos devised baetyls, [that is] he made rocks which were alive. (810:29) To Kronos there were born from Astarte seven daughters, [the] Titanids or Artemids, and also to him from Rhea seven boys, the youngest of whom was consecrated as soon as he was born. (811:3) And from Dione girls . . . and again from Astarte two boys, Pothos and Eros. (811:4) And Dagon, since he discovered [the cultivation of] grain and [the] plough was called Zeus Arotrios. One of the Titanids, cohabiting with Sydyk called the Just, gave birth to Asklepios. (811:6) In addition, three children were born to Kronos in Peraia: Kronos, having the same name as his father, and Zeus Belos, and Apollo. (811:7) Roughly contemporary with these are Pontos, and Typho and Nereus (the father of Pontos and son of Belos). (811:9) From Pontos is born Sidon who on account of her exceeding fine voice first discovered unaccompanied hymns - and Poseidon. And to Demarous is born Melkathros, who is [called] Herakles. (811:11) Then Ouranos again makes war on Pontos and, having withdrawn attaches [himself] to Demarous; and Demarous attacks Pontos, (811:12) but Pontos puts him to flight and Demarous vowed an offering for [his] escape. (811:13) In the thirty-second year of his dominion and reign El (that is Kronos), having ambushed his father Ouranos in a certain inland spot and getting him in his power, cuts off his genitals near springs and rivers. Ouranos was there sacrificed and his spirit was finished off, (811:7) and the blood of his genitals dripped into the springs and the waters of the rivers; and the place is pointed out until today.

(Eusebius)

(811:20) So great indeed, are the stories about Kronos! And such are the revered [facts] of the life (so vaunted by the Greeks!) of Kronos' contemporaries, whom, they say, were "the first and golden race of articulate men." (811:22) That blessed happiness of the ancients!

iii

809:14 tis.

This word, as Bernays first noticed, reminds the reader of the mortality of Elioun (and by implication of all his descendants).[2] It is another sign of Philo's Euhemerism; all these "mortals," (El=Kronos, Athena, etc.), would be considered gods by a non-Euhemerist. If the usage were normal it would indicate that this Elioun was not the only one called by that name, but the usage is not normal and may be deliberately impertinent, as if one were to say, "a certain Jehovah." As a matter of fact the term had been used of several deities (see below) but Philo may not have known this fact so it does not settle the question of what he intended the term to imply.

---

[2] Bernays ap. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 826, n. 16.

809:14 Elioun.

The readings of the MSS. are all incorrect; the correct name must be Ἐλιοῦν.[3] This Biblical name (see below) was evidently strange to the copyists of the P.E. Philo, who correctly rendered the name as hypsistos cannot have been responsible for the error.

Elioun is clearly a transliteration of Hebrew עליון or Aramaic עלין.[4] Although the word is not attested in known Phoenician inscriptions it must have existed in Phoenician.[5] Philo has rendered the semitic word properly as hypsistos.[6]

Literally, both Elioun and hypsistos are not proper nouns but adjectives meaning the "high (or highest) one." As such they could be applied to any god who dwells on high,[7] (Philo's specification that this one was "called hypsistos," might be distinction, but more likely is mere translation.)[8] The Bible and inscriptions show that עליון was applied to at least three gods.

One of these was El. In South Arabic inscriptions the god El is called ʿly, an epithet apparently reserved for him.[9] Genesis 14:18 speaks of אל עליון who is קנה שמים וארץ. The "High One" is the creator god and the epithet used to describe his functions as creator

---

[3] See the critical apparatus in Mras or Williams, p. 96. Mras inexplicably adopts the reading Ἐλιοῦμ, while Williams has the correct reading.

[4] See KAI 222 AI, line 11.

[5] Ugaritic, at least, has ʿly, Gordon, UT, #1855, p. 456.

[6] For עליון = Greek hypsistos see Gen. 14:18 LXX.

[7] See Williams, pp. 167-168.

[8] Cf. Della Vida, "El Elyon," pp. 2-4. [9] Lack, "Elyon," p. 49.

XUM

god is almost the same as the one applied to El in KAI 26 A III, line 18.[10] Finally, in the Sfire treaty, KAI 222A, line 11, the phrase אל ועלין appears.[11]

Another god called Elioun was apparently Baal. In a passage of the Keret epic Baal and his mṭr are twice in parallelism with ʿly and his mṭr.[12] The evidence from the Book of Hosea also supports the notion that Baal was called the "High One." This book is a long polemic against Baal worship. In both 7:16 and 11:7 the text should be corrected to introduce the god עלי , which stands for Baal.[13]

Finally, the Bible repeatedly calls YHWH Elioun, sometimes using Elioun by itself to refer to him.[14] It also uses Elioun to modify Elohim when this stands as a substitute (?) for YHWH.[15]

---

[10] This is the position adopted by Cassuto, "El Elyon," p. 287. Biblical עליון may refer to El, as perhaps in Deut. 32:8.

[11] Cassuto, ibid., argues that this name is to be understood as a double name like the Ugaritic double name kṯr wḫss - El and Elioun are not distinguished but are two names of the same god. Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," pp. 242-243 proposes a similar interpretation.

[12] Gordon, UT, 126:III:5-8. The text reads as follows: lars m[t]r bʿl wlšd mṭr ʿly. nʿm lars mṭr bʿ[l] wlšd mṭr ʿly. It is clear that bʿl and ʿly are in parallelism, as was first noticed by Eissfeldt, RS, pp. 114-116 and further developed by Lack, "Elyon," p. 48. Lack recognizes that Eissfeldt's suggestion that Ugaritic aliyn and עליון are variants is unnecessary.

[13] These emendations, proposed by Nyberg, ap. Lack, "Elyon," p. 48, are quite attractive and have been adopted in the NEB. To these emendations should be added the suggestion of Cross, Studies, pp. 223-224, to understand Deut. 33:12 as follows: ידיד ה׳ ישכן לבטח // עלי. חפף עלין כל היום לבין כתיפיו שכן . "The High One" may also be intended in Ps. 13:6 on which see Dahood, Psalms, Vol. 1, p. 47. Dahood has argued for the general principle that עלי is often intended in Psalms. See ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 45-46 and Vol. 3, p. xix.

[14] See e.g. Ps. 18:14; 21:8; 83:19; 91:9; 92:2. In all these verses עליון // YHWH.

[15] See e.g. Ps. 53:3; 78:56. Cf. Ps. 46:5; 50:14 where עליון // elohim.

Consequently, the fact that Philo uses Elioun almost as if it were a proper name, without taking the trouble to specify which "high(est) god" he meant, probably indicates that in his time and region the old variety was less apparent and the word was specific. Its reference may be indicated by the dedications to Zeus Hypsistos in several Greek inscriptions of Phoenicia,[16] and many Greek inscriptions at Palmyra; a bilingual Palmyrene inscription discovered in 1928 identifies this Zeus as Baalshamem.[17] This Elioun would thus refer to a god of the Hadad type.[18]

This interpretation of Elioun=Hypsistos is indicated by his death in an encounter with wild beasts (809:19-20). Bunsen realized that this form of death was reminiscent of the myths of dying and reviving gods,[19] and the Ugaritic myths have taught us of the death and resurrection of Baal=Hadad.[20]

If the identification of Philo's Elioun with Baalshamem is correct something odd has happened. Elioun=Baalshamem, a god of the Hadad type, is two generations older than Kronos=El. Kronos=El is the third in the line of divine kings founded by Elioun. By contrast El of the Ugaritic epics is portrayed as the chief god, the first in the line of divine rulers.[21] Philo's genealogy and succession might thus be in conflict with that of the Ugaritic epics. This may be an important clue to the nature of Philo's sources and to the validity of his theories and claims. But the importance should not be overemphasized as the odd genealogy might be explained by the confusion of several gods called Elioun.

---

[16] See the texts cited by Lack, "Elyon," p. 53. [17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid. See also Du Mesnil du Buisson, Etudes, p. 37, and Chapter Seven, pp. 179-181.

[19] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 827, n. 1. See also Eissfeldt, RS, p. 114.

[20] See Gaster, Thespis, pp. 124-129. Cf. Du Mesnil Du Buisson, Etudes, pp. 34-37.

[21] See Kapelrud, Baal, pp. 64-65; Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," p. 241. Dying and reviving gods, it should be noted, are often young gods.

809:15 B̄erouth

Berouth has been variously identified. Bochart connected her with בעל ברית of Jud. 8:33 and 9:4, 46,[22] but it is hard to see the relevance of the biblical god to Philo.[23] Du Mesnil du Buisson suggested that she is the eponymous goddess of the city of Beirut.[24] This is difficult at best because the city reappears in the fragments in 812:13 as Βηρυτόν. Also Berouth is said to have lived with Elioun περὶ Βύβλον (809:15). It is probable, of course, that a personification of the city was worshiped in Beirut, as in most hellenistic cities, although we have no evidence of such worship in Beirut.[25] But the differences of spelling and--more serious--of location remain. We therefore prefer an interpretation of Berouth first proposed by Dodwell and developed by Albright,[26]--that it is a transliteration of Hebrew (and Phoenician?)[27] בארות, the name of the goddess of wells, the

---

[22] Bochart, p. 705.

[23] On Baal Berit see e.g. Cassuto, "Baal Berit," p. 286.

[24] Du Mesnil du Buisson, Etudes, p. 31.

[25] Du Mesnil du Buisson, ibid., p. 71 compounds the difficulty of his theory by admitting that Elioun and Asherah--whom he supposes to have been the original goddess of the city--were not worshiped in Beirut of Philo's day and by supposing that Philo's information about them must have been archaeological.

[26] Dodwell, p. 46; Albright, "Aleyan Baal and Mot," p. 190.

[27] See Harris, Grammar, s.v. באר , p. 85, citing Stephanus of

XUM

subterranean sources of water, a perfect consort of Elioun or Baal, the god of rain.[28]

809:15 *peri Byblou*.

Throughout this section Byblos has primacy. It is therefore likely that Byblian myths were the sources of the information in this section of the fragments. Here we learn that Elioun and Berouth lived near Byblos.[29]

809:15-17 *ex hōn - ouranon*.

Three pieces of information are given (1) that the male child of Elioun and Berouth was called Epigeios Autochthon, Terrestial native; (2) that he was later called Ouranos; and (3) that Ouranos was so beautiful that his name was applied to the beautiful sky. Of these points the third is the clearest. Philo has already implied (805:5-7) that the ancients used the names of their own kings as names for parts of the universe. We are now given an example of this principle: the sky was called Ouranos after the beautiful mortal named Ouranos.[30]

As to the second piece of information, the origin of the name Ouranos and when and by whom it was first used are unexplained in the fragments. Changes of name in the Bible are represented as significant.

Byzantium, who gives Bηρ= well, as the source of the name Beirut. Stephanus also cites from the *Phoinikika* of Hestaios an alternative explanation, that in Phoenician Bηρούτι means strength. See *FGrH* 786.

[28] Cf. Gen. 7:11.

[29] Du Mesnil du Buisson attempts to avoid this difficulty, *Etudes*, pp. 32-33, by supposing that Philo added the reference to Byblos to this Beirutian tradition because he was confused by the temple of Zeus Hypsistos at Byblos.

[30] Jacoby, in the critical apparatus *ad loc*. proposes reorganizing the text. The order in Philo is now intelligible and no reorganization is necessary.

When Abram's name is changed to Abraham this is said to be a sign of the covenant between YHWH and Abraham and of the promise of progeny.[31] The change of Epigeios' name to Ouranos may have had some significance--this seems likely because the change involves contradiction, the terrestial native becomes a celestial being--but the fragments give no clue. Perhaps part of the explanation is in a fragment of Euhemerus whom Philo followed. Euhemerus also suggests that Ouranos originally had some other name: πρῶτον θυσίαις τιμῆσαι τοὺς οὐρανίους θεούς . διὸ καὶ Οὐρανὸν προσαγορευθῆναι, "he was the first to honor the heavenly gods with sacrifices, wherefore he was called Ouranos."[32] Philo's name change might thus have been inspired by Euhemerus'.

Epigeios Autochthon, the original name, is even more obscure. It is hard to see what Phoenician title it translates. Lagrange and Williams both believe that this name is somehow connected with Hesiod's Theogony in which Ouranos is born from Ge (Philo's Ouranos is Epigeios).[33] This connection is open to some doubt as Philo's Ouranos and Ge are siblings, the children of Elioun and Berouth, while Hesiod's Ouranos and Ge are parent and child.[34]

Ouranos would obviously be שמם in Phoenician.[35] Philo's "mortal" Ouranos (and Ge below) were presumably, as usual, gods. The worship of such gods by Phoenicians is suggested by the Sfire treaty

---

[31] See Gen. Ch. 18. [32] FGrH 63 F 2.

[33] Lagrange, p. 354 and Williams, p. 168, based on Hesiod, Th. 126ff.

[34] One is tempted to suppose that some similar legend lies behind Philo's Epigeios Autochthon and Gen. 2:6.

[35] See Harris, Grammar, s.v. שמם , p. 151.

XUM

where Heaven and Earth, שמי[ן] וארק[...], are invoked as witnesses.[36] A recently discovered Ugaritic text speaks of arṣ w šmm š, "Earth and Heaven (to receive an offering of) a male head of small cattle."[37] Another Phoenician text also speaks of Heaven and Earth as gods.[38] Philo is therefore correct in speaking of the "mortals" Ouranos and Ge--these were gods for non-Euhemeristic Phoenicians.

807:17-19 gennatai - Gēn.

Ge's name was never changed it seems, but her name was also applied to a part of the physical world--the earth. In Phoenician she would be ארץ.[39] Philo has Ouranos and Ge as a pair, much like in Hesiod and the texts discussed above.

809:19-20 ho de - etelesan

The manner of Elioun's death and its significance have been discussed above, p. 220. After his death Elioun was worshiped by his children. Once again Philo is consistent: the manner of worship corresponds with his description of the religious practices of the most ancient peoples. (805:25ff.).[40]

809:21-22 paralabōn - Gēn

Ouranos and Ge, full brother and sister, marry. Marriages between brothers and sisters also occur in Greek and Ugaritic myth, e.g. between Zeus and Hera or Baal and Anat.[41] Such marriages also occurred in real life. Not to mention the Ptolemies, the Eshmunazar inscription records the king's ancestors and those of his wife.[42] Eshmunazar's parents were clearly brother and sister.

---

[36] The Lake and its sources, Day and Night, and other witnesses are invoked in the Sfire treaty. It is hard to be certain all of these were gods. Cf. Deut. 32:1 where Heaven and Earth are invoked, more as eternal than as gods. Polybius 7,9,2 includes Heaven and Earth among the witnesses of the treaty between Philip V and Carthage. Perhaps these gods appear as gods of the Greeks; See Clemen, pp. 61-62.

[37] Text cited and translated in Gordon, UT, #376, p. 367.

[38] Cross, "Phoenician Incantation," p. 44, line 13.

[39] See Harris, Grammar, s.v. ארץ, p. 81.

[40] Cf. Chapter Seven, p. 197.

809:22-23 kai poieitai - Atlanta.

Ouranos and Ge had four children: Kronos=El, the first of the children, is the main character of this section. El is the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, the creator of mankind, and ultimate authority. He lives in the depths of the sea together with his consort.[43] El is also mentioned in several Phoenician and Aramaic inscriptions.[44] It would thus seem that he continued to occupy an important place in the religion of the later periods, after Ugarit. Philo's identification of El with Greek Kronos is not confirmed by any bilingual inscriptions but is certainly correct.[45] The same identification is found in Damascius and Diodorus.[46] Philo will tell stories about his Kronos=El much like the Greek stories told of Kronos.

Baitylos poses many problems, chief of which is his relationship to the betyls later invented by Ouranos in his war against Kronos. (810:28). It would seem that they must be different: Baitylos is a "mortal," hence a god, the betyls stone objects. Yet the names are so similar and the possibilities of confusion numerous. These problems will be discussed in greater detail in the comments on 810:28.

---

[41] See Van Selms, Marriage, pp. 69ff.

[42] KAI 14, lines 13-15. See the comments in KAI ad loc., Vol. 2, p. 22.

[43] Cf. Pope. El, pp. 102-103.

[44] See KAI 26 A III, line 18 and KAI 222 A I, line 11.

[45] See Güterbock, Kumarbi, p. 112 and Williams, pp. 169-170.

[46] Damascius, Vita Isidori 115; D.S. 2,30,3.

Dagon, the third of the children, is translated by Philo as Greek *Siton* or corn. Philo understood the god's name as Hebrew, Phoenician, and Ugaritic דגן . *Dgn* both as the name for corn and as a deity appears in all three languages and cultures.[47] Consistent with these facts is the information Philo gives in 811:4ff. concerning Dagon's discovery of (the cultivation of) grain and of the plow.

Atlas is a problem of a different order. Philo gives only the Greek and not the Phoenician name, although by analogy with the others one would expect Atlas to have been a Phoenician god.[48] The only real clue to Atlas' identity is given in 810:14ff. where his punishment and banishment to the depths of the earth are narrated. This will be discussed in the commentary on that passage.

809:23-25 *kai - allēlōn*.

In addition to these children by Ge, Ouranos had other children by other wives. This, in Philo's story, is the origin of the dispute between Ouranos and Ge. Hesiod's Ouranos was married only to Ge,[49] and

---

[47] See Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. דגן , p. 95 and Gordon, *UT*, #644, p. 384. There is also, of course, the temple of *dgn* at Ugarit. Bunsen, Vol. 5, pp. 828-829, n. 2 realized the significance of our passage for the debate over the identity of the god mentioned in I Sam. 5.

[48] Clemen, pp. 68-69 and Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 65 argue that Atlas must be Phoenician because Hesiod's Atlas is Kronos' nephew, not his brother (Hesiod, *Th*. 517ff.; 746ff.). Philo, however, may have preferred a different form of the myth in which Atlas was Kronos' brother. Cf. D.S. 3,60. Thus the best argument for making Atlas a Phoenician god is the analogy to the other characters.

[49] Other Greek traditions about Ouranos give him at least four more wives and other children. See e.g. Euhemerus *FGrH* 63 F 2.

XUM

he fights with Ge for a different reason: their children were most fearsome (deinotatoi), hence Ouranos hated them, kept them inside Ge, and did not let them be born. Ge consequently suffered and therefore devised a punishment for Ouranos.[50] Here a comparison of Philo and Hesiod is informative: Philo, the near easterner, explains the conflict as arising from jealousy, an explanation I have nowhere found in Greek or near eastern sources. This looks like an attempt to humanize the myth, consistent with Philo's Euhemerism. Hesiod, the Greek, explains the origins of the conflict in a way much the same as does the beginning of the Enuma Elish.[51]

809:25-810:2 ho de Ouranos - syllexamenēn.

The explanations of the relations between Ouranos and Ge continue to be in human terms. Ouranos provokes Ge by forcibly having sexual relations with her and also by attempting to kill their children. These elements are not in Hesiod's version of the dispute between Ouranos and Ge, where Ouranos seems to force the children back into Ge (lines 155-160)--clearly a mythological account. Philo's Ouranos merely wants to kill them after their birth.[52] Again, the course of events would seem to have been rationalized.

810:2-5 eis andras - tēi mētri.

Kronos becomes the leader of Ge and her party in the wars against Ouranos. Most of this section of the fragments is devoted to a description of these wars, which last for at least thirty-two years. By contrast, although the Greeks told much about the wars of Kronos and the Titans against Zeus, and of Zeus against the Giants,[53] there is little in Greek sources about the war of Ouranos and Kronos other than the account of the original castration. Having been deposed, Ouranos continues to give oracles to his descendants, but he does not attempt to regain the kingship.[54] There are thus few Greek parallels to the central portion of Philo's life of Kronos. In Phoenician terms these stories are also disturbing. In Ugaritic it seems that El is the first divine king; he has younger competitors, but no older rivals from whom he originally took the kingship.[55] Yet Philo tells a long story of the taking of the kingship from Ouranos by Kronos=El. These difficulties may be a clue to the nature of Philo's sources and the validity of his theories.

---

[50] Hesiod, Th. 154ff. The interpretation followed is that of West, Theogony, pp. 213-215.

[51] Noticed by West, Theogony, p. 213.

[52] Cf. Apollodorus, Bibliotheca 1,4, where Ouranos throws his children into Tartaros.

Hermes Trismegistos is Kronos' secretary. This passage is the earliest mention of the title Trismegistos.[56] Hermes clearly stands for Taautos, introduced and discussed earlier, and his functions in this passage correspond to the previous description.[57] It is appropriate for the inventor of writing to be the secretary, as it is appropriate for Taautos=Thoth to be a god who can speak magical words (810: 7-9).[58] The use of Hermes, rather than Taautos, is however odd.

---

[53] See Vian, Guerre des Geants, pp. 170-174.

[54] Hesiod, Th. 463-465; 888ff.; 468ff. See Walcot, Hesiod, p. 5.

[55] See Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," p. 241.

[56] See Nock, in the introduction to his edition of the Corpus Hermeticum. p. iv.

[57] See Chapter Five, pp. 78-87.

[58] See Boylan, Thoth, pp. 93-94.

Equally difficult is Hermes as counselor of Kronos, an idea known from Greek Egypt;[59] Ugaritic El did not have a cunning counselor. The possibility of this being a borrowing from post-Ptolemaic Egypt is quite high. Such borrowing from Alexandria would make borrowing from classical Greek sources all the more likely.

810:5-7 *Kronōi - doru*.

Kronos has two daughters, Persephone and Athena - their mother(s) not mentioned. In Greek mythology both these goddesses were children of Zeus, which suggests that Philo is not thinking of the Greek Persephone and Athena but of the Phoenician goddesses identified with the Greek goddesses.

Against the supposition of a Phoenician origin for Persephone is Lagrange's conjecture that the story of her rape by Hades may explain Philo's statement that she died a virgin.[60] But virgin heroines--probably virgin deities--were not unknown in Palestine (Jud. 11:34-40) and there was a cult of Persephone in Samaria.[61] Clemen rightly rejects Lagrange's conjecture but admits ignorance as to the Phoenician equivalent.[62] Lokkegaard is less hesitant and thinks that Persephone in Philo equals Ugaritic *Arṣiyu* *Bt* *Y‘dr*.[63] She, according to Lokkegaard is one of Baal's nymphs, yet when Baal goes to the netherworld he takes his whole entourage with him (67:V:6-11) but *not* her. This, Lokkegaard argues, shows that she is already in the earth, that she is some sort of earth goddess (as her name suggests), who may therefore be identified with Persephone.[64] Lokkegaard's suggestion is possible and even attractive. It cannot however be proven given the lack of documentation.

---

[59] Hecataeus, *FGrH* 264 F 25=D.S. 1,16,2. Hecataeus' Hermes advises Osiris.

[60] Lagrange, p. 387. For the historiography of interpretations of this passage see Clemen, p. 68.

[61] See Vincent, "Helene à Samarie," p. 221. See also IGLS 2978 and the discussion there.

[62] Clemen, p. 68. [63] See Gordon, *UT*, # 376, p. 367.

Philo's Athena is more readily identified. Gruppe already realized the significance of the bilingual Cypriot inscription dedicated to ענת צעז חים in Phoenician and Athena Soteria Nike in Greek.[65] The identification of Athena and Anat is apt as both are goddesses of battle.[66] If Philo followed the same tradition as this inscription (a likely assumption since Philo's identifications always agree with those of the inscriptions)[67] he would have intended Anat when he wrote Athena.[68]

Kronos prepares for battle with Ouranos and fashions a sickle and spear of iron with the help of Athena and Hermes. The way in which these weapons are introduced suggests there must be something special about them, like the weapons ktr w̱ḫss makes for Baal or Hephaistos for

---

[64] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 65. Cf. Albright, YGC, p. 128. If Albright's analysis of Pidraya is correct she might be an equivalent of Persephone.

[65] KAI 42. Gruppe, p. 405.

[66] On Anat see Gordon, UT, ʿnt:II:5ff; on Athena, Rose, Handbook, pp. 107-112.

[67] See Chapter Five, p. 82 , n. 16.

[68] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 65 inexplicably rejects the identification of Athena and Anat on the grounds that there is "no certain reason for Philo to undertake the same identification" (as the inscription). But is it not much more plausible for Philo to have made the same identification as the inscription, particularly when his identifications always agree with those of the inscriptions? The identification proposed by Lokkegaard, with Padriyu of Ugarit, is much less likely than Gruppe's. It must be added that Athena is given dominion over Attica in 812:5, an indication that Philo is thinking in Greek terms as well as Phoenician. This is discussed more fully in the commentary on 812:5.

Achilles.[69] The extant fragments do not narrate Kronos' use of these weapons. The parallels with Hesiod suggest that the sickle was used in castrating Ouranos (811:13-20).[70] In Philo, however, it has no function, though the castration story is not suppressed but told in a different connection and with different details. Does this indicate that Philo took the sickle from Hesiod? But he says nothing either of the function of the spear, which is not in Hesiod. Since sickle and spear are mentioned together, as if connected, the likelihood is that both came from some story considerably different from Hesiod's.

Athena and Hermes advise Kronos in fashioning these weapons. Why Hermes=Taautos=Thoth was competent to advise in making weapons is not clear--perhaps, as god of wisdom, he knew everything, or, as god of magic, he could give the weapons special magical powers. Athena knew something about spears (the spear was one of her attributes),[71] but it is more likely that she functions here as goddess of wisdom, including the handicrafts and prudent advice. This would be the role of Greek Athena, and not that of the Ugaritic Anat who fights for her brother Baal but does not help fashion his armor--that is done by *kṯr wḫss*.[72]

810:7-9 *eita - Gēs*.

Hermes' role was discussed above, pp. 228-229.

810:9-10 *kai houtōs - diedexato*.

Ouranos loses his kingship to Kronos in the battle. Ouranos, however, does not disappear from the scene after his defeat but continues to attempt to win his place back. He is not castrated and killed until the thirty-second year of Kronos' reign, that is until thirty-two years after this defeat (811:13-20). This is unlike the Greek myths in which Ouranos is castrated and never attempts to regain his position, virtually disappearing from the scene.[73]

---

[69] Gordon, *UT*, 68:12ff and Homer, *Il*. 18, 476ff.

[70] Hesiod, *Th*. 175.

[71] See Lagrange, p. 387 and Orelli, p. 28, n. 62.

[72] Gordon, *UT*, ʿnt:III:35ff.

810:10-12 healō - gamon.

Kronos as victor distributes the spoils, particularly the women.[74] Dagon gets Ouranos' pregnant concubine. Clemen has seen further significance in these lines. When Kronos distributes Ouranos' wives, according to Clemen, it indicates his title to the kingship, much as in the Bible Solomon controls the fortunes of Abishag. When a former royal concubine is given to Dagon this distinguishes him from the other gods.[75]

810:12-13 tiktei - Dēmaroun

Demarous is Ouranos' child born after his mother was given to Dagon. Demarous is mentioned several times in the extant fragments. He is the father of Melqart (811:10); he fights Pontos and loses (811:11-13); and he together with Astarte and Hadad rule the land with the consent of Kronos (811:24-25). Demarous, as Ewald already saw, must be connected somehow with the Phoenician river mentioned by Strabo as the Tamyras, and by Polybius as the Damouras.[76] This river is between Sidon and Beirut; its appearance in this part of the fragments is an exception to the usual Byblian setting.

---

[73] See n. 54.

[74] Cf. Jud. 5:30.

[75] See Clemen, pp. 63-64, based on II Sam. 16:21ff. and I Kings 2:17ff.

[76] Ewald, p. 24. Strabo 16,2,22; Polybius 5,68,9.

The central point of recent debate about Demarous has been whether he is to be identified with Baal, whether his name is really an epithet of Baal. Among scholars who have argued for this identification Lokkegaard sees Demarous as a transliteration of *ḏu maruṣ* which, he thinks, means the "weakened one," a proper epithet of Baal because that is what his other title (*zbl*) means.[77] That Demarous is a transliteration of *ḏu maruṣ* is doubtful, but that either *ḏu maruṣ* or *zbl* means the "weakened one" is preposterous.[78] More cogent reasons for identifying Demarous and Baal were proposed by Cassuto,[79] who pointed to a difficult passage in the Ugaritic epics in which *dmrn* is in parallelism to Hadad.[80] Ugaritic *dmrn* thus may have been a poetic variant for Baal, as one of Baal's epithets. Philo's Demarous appears once in the fragments in the dative, as *Dēmarounti* (811:10), so that all four consonants of the Ugaritic name appear in Philo. Cassuto also noted that Philo's Demarous fights and loses to Pontos, much as Baal of the epics fights and loses (at first) to Yam.[81] In addition, Cassuto revived the emendation first proposed by Gruppe[82] in 811:24-25. That text reads that Hadad and Zeus Demarous ruled the land: Ζεὺς Δημαροῦς καὶ Ἄδωδος; Cassuto suggested ὁ καὶ Ἄδωδος, thus equating Demarous and Hadad or Baal.[83] Finally, he argued that Baal in the Ugaritic epics is sometimes described as the son of El, at other times as the son of Dagon,[84] while Demarous in Philo can also be described as the son of two, if not three gods. Ouranos is his real father, but Kronos=El has authority over him and gives him to Dagon, his step-father.

---

[77] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 66. For *zbl* as Baal's title see Gordon, *UT*, #815, p. 395.

[78] See especially Held, "*Zbl/sbl*," pp. 90-92.

[79] Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous," pp. 65-67.

[80] Gordon, *UT*, 51:VII:38-39. The passage reads as follows *ib hd-lm tḫš//lm tḫš ntq dmrn*. By elimination *hd-* (to be completed as *hdd* or Hadad), must be in parallelism to *dmrn*.

[81] Gordon, *UT*, 137:36-37. See also Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 73.

[82] Gruppe, pp. 356-360.

Cassuto concerned himself solely with the Ugaritic evidence and did not mention the river *Tamyras* or *Damouras*, yet Cassuto's *dmrn* could easily have been the name given to that river, thus tying together all the evidence presented. Baal or *dmrn* is the god of the heavenly waters, but as one Ugaritic passage indicates he also controls the waters below. When Danel curses the land he prays that Baal should fail for seven years. There is to be no *ṭl*, no *rbb*, no *šrʿ thmtm*, and no *ṭbn ql bʿl*.[85] The third of these terms means "welling up of the deep,"[86] and clearly refers to the waters from below.

The evidence presented by Cassuto is convincing and I accept his identification. But there is one difficulty which should be noted. In Ugaritic the letter *d* is used to stand for two letters, *d* and *ḏ*;[87] *dmrn* can thus also be *ḏmrn*. Cassuto, in order to make the epithet *dmrn* comprehensible for Baal, suggests that it should be understood as the latter. As such, it would mean the strong or mighty one,[88] and would be the equivalent of Baal's other epithet aliyn,[89] but it would have entered Hebrew and Phoenician as זמרן,[90] and in Greek transliteration this name would be Zemarous and not Demarous.[91] This difficulty is not sufficient to overturn Cassuto's case; dmrn may yet be found perfectly comprehensible as an epithet for Baal and there will be no need to assume that it was ḏmrn.

---

[83] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 66, n. 1 suggests that the emendation may be unnecessary, because *kai* may equal *ho kai* in Philo's usage. Cf. Blass & Debrunner *Grammar of the NT*, #268,1, p. 140. Lokkegaard is also incorrect about Philo's usage. See 808:8; 809:22; 811:10;812:12 where Philo uses *ho kai*.

[84] See Kapelrud, *Baal*, pp. 64-65.

[85] Gordon, *UT*, I Aqht:45.

[86] Ginsberg in *ANET*, p. 153. See also *ibid*., n. 34.

[87] Gordon, *UT*, 5.3, pp. 26-27.

810:13-14 epi toutois - Byblon.

The primacy of Byblos, first suggested in 809:15, is here reasserted. Contrast the primacy of Tyre in 807:19-809:13. It seems likely that the two contradictory mythologies come from two temples of these two cities.

810:14-16 meta tauta - katechōse.

Philo merely tells us that Kronos suspected Atlas and therefore banished him, without saying what Atlas had done to merit this punishment. He may have been suspected of rebellion, perhaps of plotting to depose Kronos=El and to sit on the throne.

Du Mesnil du Buisson has plausibly suggested that Philo's account may be a version of the story also told of הלל בן שחר in Isaiah 14:12ff.[92] The story in Isaiah has been recognized as an echo of some ancient myth.[93] הלל plotted to "scale the sky," and set his throne "above El's stars." He hoped to "match Elyon" and to "sit in the assembled gathering in heaven." Instead he was punished, "brought down to Sheol, to the lowest pit."[94] This punishment would explain Philo's equation of הלל with Atlas, who is located by Hesiod just outside the gates of Tartaros.[95] We may therefore accept Du Mesnil du Buisson's suggestion.

---

[88] Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous," p. 66. See also Gordon, UT, #727, p. 388.

[89] Ibid., # 1342, p. 426.

[90] The Ugaritic ḏ becomes a ז in Hebrew and Phoenician, Gordon, UT, 5.13, p. 30.

[91] This is the normal pattern of transliteration of Hebrew names in the Septuagint. See e.g. Gen. 30:20 LXX.

[92] Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Groupe," pp. 44-49.

810:16-18 *kata touton - aphierōsan*.

According to 809:11-12 the Dioskouroi invented a boat.[96] Philo now tells us what happened on one (the first?) voyage. The Mt. Kassios on which they were cast ashore can be either than on the Syrian coast or that in Egypt. Philo does not specify which one.[97]

810:18-19 *hoi de - Kronou*.

Ἤλου τοῦ Κρόνου would ordinarily mean of El, son of Kronos. But El and Kronos have been identified (809:22). Therefore no commentator on the fragments or translator of Eusebius, to my knowledge, has rendered "El, son of Kronos." Instead all have translated the phrase as if Philo had written τοῦ καὶ Κρόνου, or as if τοῦ Κρόνου were in parentheses or set off by commas, thus maintaining the equivalence of El and Kronos. It is probably easiest to set *tou Kronou* between commas, as was done by Bunsen.[98]

---

[93] Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon," p. 51, n. 23.

[94] These quotations and translations are Ginsberg's, *ibid*., p. 51. Cf. Euhemerus account of Atlas, *FGrH* 63 F 14.

[95] Hesiod, *Th*. 746 and West's note to it.

[96] See Chapter Seven, p. 199.

[97] Cf. Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 32.

[98] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 831.

XUM

The meaning of the phrases as a whole was most clearly seen by Lagrange. Philo, according to Lagrange, assumes that his readers are familiar with the term for the gods in Phoenician אלנם,[99] or אלהן in Aramaic.[100] As a good Euhemerist Philo would like to show that this term was originally applied to mortals. He is accordingly telling his reader, do not think that אלהים or אלים are groups of gods. The word was originally applied to the "human" allies of the "mortal" El,[101] as they would have been called Κρόνιοι had the nickname been based on Kronos.

810:19-23 *Kronos - gnōmēn*.

Kronos *murdered* or *executed* two of his children - the boy Sadid and an unnamed girl - because he suspected them, probably of plotting against him. This story is apparently different from the stories of Kronos' *sacrifices* of his children narrated in 812:6-7 and 813:26-814:17. Therefore the attempts of Bunsen and Eissfeldt to equate Sadid of our passage with Yeoud (the boy sacrificed in 814:13) and to read Yeoud in our passage are not justified.[102]

810:23-26 *chronou - epoiēsato*

The three wives Kronos acquires in this passage are the same wives, whose children by Kronos are discussed in 810:29-811:4. The text specifies that Ouranos was the common father of Kronos and these wives, but it does not specify that Ge was their common mother. The marriages are nonetheless sufficiently incestuous to call for comment, which is odd since mythology was notoriously outside the bounds of everyday morality[103] (thus the incest of Ouranos and Ge was passed over in silence). Perhaps the incest in this case was of some political or liturgical importance.

---

[99] See the passages cited in KAI, Vol. 3, p. 2.

[100] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[101] Lagrange, p. 389. Cf. Torrey, "God of Sarepta," pp. 45-49.

[102] Bunsen, Vol. 4, p. 247; Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, p. 19. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 74.

Each of the wives here assigned to Kronos poses a problem of a different sort. Astarte, the first, is here identified by Phoenician name only, but in 812:3 she is equated with Greek Aphrodite. In Phoenician terms Astarte might have been the consort of El in the pantheon of some city, but that city cannot be identified. We do know that the city cannot have been Ugarit where El's consort was Lady Asherah of the Sea.[104] In Greek terms the coupling of Kronos and Aphrodite is unusual; the male gods usually associated with her are Ares and Hephaistos.[105]

Philo does not identify Rhea with a Phoenician goddess and no equations have been proposed by scholars who have studied the fragments. In Greek terms, however, her presence as Kronos' consort makes sense.[106]

In 812:12-13 Dione is identified as Baaltis of Byblos, that is as the "Lady of Byblos," בעלת גבל known from inscriptions.[107] The god El, as we shall see, was also known at Byblos, but there is no certain evidence, to confirm Philo, that the Byblians believed El and the Lady of Byblos were consorts. When בעלת גבל is mentioned in

---

[103] The Greek reaction against the "immorality" of mythology can already be seen in Xenophanes DK B 11-12.

[104] See Pope, El, pp. 36-37.

[105] I have found no trace of the couple Kronos and Aphrodite.

[106] Rose, Handbook, p. 21.

[107] KAI 5,6 etc.

Byblian inscriptions she is usually alone.[108] She must be introduced by emendation in KAI 4,[109] but if the emendation is correct she is there mentioned together with the מפחרת אל גבל קדשם "assembly of the holy gods of Byblos," and Baalshamem.[110] In spite of this difficulty Philo is probably correct in coupling Baalat Gebal and El. The consort of Baalat Gebal must be the Baal Gebal, who in Philo's myth is certainly El.[111] There are therefore some difficulties in all three of the couples. Some Phoenicians or Greeks may have made Kronos=El the husband of each of these goddesses, but we lack evidence to prove this beyond doubt.

810:26-28 gnous-katesche.

The mission of Astarte, Rhea and Dione having failed Ouranos sends Heimarmene, Hora and others against Kronos. This mission fails as its members desert Ouranos for Kronos. Scholars have properly hesitated to propose Phoenician equivalents for Heimarmene and Hora. Lokkegaard has recently suggested that Heimarmene may be the equivalent of Hebrew גד,[112] which in turn may exist in Ugaritic.[113] She would be a goddess of harmony and thus properly equated with Heimarmene.[114] This interpretation, as Lokkegaard admits, is possible at best and it

---

[108] KAI 5, 6, 7, and 10.

[109] The text reads בעל, but the emendation to בעלת is virtually certain.

[110] KAI 4, lines 3-4.

[111] Moscati, Phoenicians, pp. 31-32. The couple of Kronos and Dione is unusual in Greek terms as Dione is normally associated with Zeus. Rose, Handbook, p. 53.

[112] See BDB s.v. גד II, p. 151. [113] Gordon, UT, 121:4.

[114] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 67.

XUM

seems best to concede that we do not know the significance of these lines.

810:28-29 eti de-mēchanēsamenos.

Ouranos' two attempts on Kronos have failed. Lokkegaard has the merit of recognizing that the invention of betyls is a third attempt. The betyls, or animated stones, were described by Damascius as having the property of independent movement.[115] As such they could attack Kronos or ward him off from afar.[116] Philo's Euhemerism is again apparent. He knows that betyls are worshiped by Phoenicians as divine (see below) and therefore stresses the origin of the betyls, their invention by the "mortal" Ouranos for his wars.

The best evidence for the worship of betyls by the Phoenicians is that of the coins. A very popular Sidonian coin type, first minted at the time of Augustus, shows the betyl in its car.[117] A Byblian coin type shows a temple with a conical betyl exposed.[118] Tyrian coins present the two "ambrosial rocks," which may also be betyls.[119] The betyls must have commanded the devotion and loyalty of the people to appear on the coins so frequently.

The cult of betyls, as Bochart already recognized must be connected with the events narrated in Gen. chapter 28.[120] In v. 22 Jacob

---

[115] Damascius, Vita Isidori Fragmenta (Ed. Zintzen), Frag. 203.

[116] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 68.

[117] See Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Sidon # 207 and many others.

[118] Ibid., Byblos, # 37.

[119] Ibid., Tyre, # 429. See Chapter Seven, p. 197.

[120] Bochart, p. 708. The connection Bochart saw between Philo and Gen. 28 is quite different than the one made today.

XUM

says that the stone on which he slept and which he has annointed (28:18) shall be a בית אלהים, a house of God. Presumably Jacob recognizes that this stone is connected with the visions, and he therefore supposes the stone is a house of a god. Betyls, with their supposed property of independent movement, must have required an explanation, and they too must have been understood as abodes of gods, each one a בית אל.[121]

In addition to the betyls of this passage, Philo also speaks of a god called Baitylos in 809:23. The worship by the Phoenicians of a god by this name is confirmed by the treaty between Baalu of Tyre and Esarhaddon. Ba-a-a-ti-ilani, or Baitylos, is one of the divine guarantors of the treaty.[122] The god's name also appears compounded in several personal names,[123] and may also be intended in Jer. 48:13.[124] The god was worshiped by the Jewish community at Elephantine,[125] and is mentioned, as Zeus Betylos, in an inscription of the Roman period from Doura.[126]

Philo, it would seem, has two separate entities--the stone betyls

---

[121] To my knowledge, only Zuntz, "Baitylos and Bethel," pp. 178-179 has doubted this interpretation.

[122] Baalu treaty, lines 6-7, ANET Supplement, p. 98.

[123] For a selection of these names see Eissfeldt, "Bethel," p. 21.

[124] Milik, "Cultes," p. 565 argues that this verse does not necessarily prove that there was a god Bethel. The parallelism, according to Milik, need not suggest that Bethel is a god as Chemosh is a god. Rather, Milik argues, the verse means that as the Moabites were embarrassed because of their unjustified faith in Chemosh, so the Israelites will be embarrassed of their unjustified faith in Bethel--the place and the sanctuary.

[125] The compound deities of Elephantine are discussed by Milik, "Cultes," pp. 565-577.

[126] Baur & Rostovtzeff, Excavations at Dura, Fourth Season, pp. 68ff.

XUM

and the "mortal" Baitylos. The existence of each is confirmed by external evidence. The names of the two are so similar there should be some connection between them, yet Philo does not explain their relationship. Nor does the other evidence about the stones or the god answer this question unequivocally, and the subject remains obscure. Scholars have disagreed widely as to which people or peoples were particularly devoted to Baitylos, who spread his worship, and what were his functions.[127]

810:29-811:2 *Kronōi - aphierōthē*.

This passage is the beginning of a genealogical section in which the fragments are even briefer and more enigmatic than usual. Kronos and Astarte are the parents of the seven Titanids or Artemids. Lagrange was disturbed by the apparent mention of two Greek names rather than the usual pattern of one Phoenician and one equivalent Greek name. He therefore suggested that Titanids was an error for *Tanitides*, seven Tanits or goddesses of Carthage.[128] Cooke was attracted by Lagrange's suggestion but reluctant to adopt it, probably because there is no evidence of seven Tanits.[129]

Albright has recently made an attractive proposal. He notes that Artemids, in Greek terms, could refer to birth goddesses, as that is one of Artemis' functions. The Ugaritic epic of Aqhat, Albright maintains,

---

[127] Baitylos is so enigmatic that we cannot even utilize the one clue to his functions provided by the Baalu treaty. Baitylos will punish the treaty breaker by sending hungry lions against him. This punishment must somehow be related to Baitylos' functions, but how? Cf. Rofé, *Emunah Bemalachim*, pp. 232-234. For scholarly disagreement compare the analyses of Milik, "Cultes," pp. 565-577; Rofé, *Emunah Bemalachim*, pp. 219-234; Albright, *ARI*, pp. 162-168.

[128] Lagrange, p. 388.

[129] Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 133, n. 2.

XUM

also has seven birth goddesses or Koscharot; Artemids, Titanids, and Koscharot are therefore to be identified.[130] Albright's suggestion, though attractive, is far from certain, and some of the details on which it is based are open to doubt. I do not see where in the Aqhat epic *seven* Koscharot are mentioned; they stay for seven days but this does not mean they were seven.[131] Also I doubt that the Aqhat passage by itself proves that these were birth goddesses. The Koscharot come at the time of conception and Danel begins to count the months of pregnancy after they leave.[132] The delivery is never described in the extant tablets so we do not know whether the Koscharot participated. If they were present at conception but not at delivery they would not be birth goddesses. For the Titanids see below on 811:5-6.

In addition to the seven girls Kronos had by Astarte he had seven boys by Rhea. The youngest of these boys died at birth and was consecrated (ἀφιερώθη) as divine. This interpretation of the passage is confirmed by several other passages in the fragments. Philo often uses *aphieroō* in contexts where it must mean consecrate and not sacrifice,[133] such as in 809:20 where the death of Elioun is mentioned. Elioun, having died, *aphierōthē*; clearly this must mean "he was consecrated." In addition Philo retells the story of the death of the boy in 812:9-11.[134]

---

[130] Albright, *YGC*, p. 143 following a suggestion of Clemen, p. 72.

[131] Gordon, *UT*, :2 Aqht:II:39. [132] *Ibid.*, 2 Aqht:II:43ff.

[133] *Aphieroō* can mean sacrifice, as in *P.E.* 3,11,46.

[134] The child consecrated in 812:9-11 is called ἕτερον αὐτοῦ παῖδα, suggesting that this is not the same child whose death is discussed in our passage. But as we shall see in the commentary on 812:9-11, *heteron* distinguishes Mouth from the child sacrificed in 812:6, and not from the child of our passage.

The child of 812:9-11 was also the son of Kronos and Rhea; his name was Mouth (מות) or death. Of him Philo writes, ἀποθάνοντα ἀφιεροῖ, which must mean, [Kronos] "consecrated him after his death."

811:3-4 kai apo - Erōs.

The number and names of the children of Kronos and Dione has fallen out of the MSS., as Jacoby rightly saw. The two boys of Kronos and Astarte, Pothos and Eros, seem to have so puzzled commentators that they offered no comments. Perhaps the full text of the Phoenician History would have given a clearer indication of Philo's meaning. But as things are it looks as if these were the well-known children of the Greek Aphrodite.[135]

811:4-5 ho de Dagon - Arotrios.

Dagon's invention of corn and the plow were discussed above, p. 226.

811:5-6 Sydykōi - Asklēpion.

More information about Sydyk and his children, including Asklepios, will be given in 813:1-2. The entire subject will therefore be discussed in the commentary on those lines.

811:6-7 egennēthēsan - Apollōn.

Another group of Kronos' children, whose mother(s) are not named in the extant fragments, are those "born in Peraia." Peraia is difficult to place. Bunsen thought it might be in Transjordan or in Upper Mesopotamia.[136] He preferred the latter, on the basis of Stephanus of Byzantium's entry concerning Nisibis (in which some of the information is derived from Philo), and in which Nisibis is placed in "the peraia." (817:5-9).[137] But this is uncertain; Stephanus also gives s.v. Peraia, πολίχνιον Συρίας, "a small town in Syria," "The peraia" is not a place name but a common noun (as is indicated by the article and the specifying noun which follows). If peraia in 811:6 were also a common noun it could mean on the "other side" of almost any river, strait, or the like. Many regions of the ancient world were presumably thus known locally.[138]

---

[135] See Höfer, "Pothos," cols. 2903-4.

[136] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 833, n. 17.

Philo's Peraia could be identified on two conditions: (1) if Philo meant "god worshiped in Peraia" when he wrote of "mortals born in Peraia;" and (2) if these gods could be identified and the place where they were worshiped established. The first of these conditions is probably met thanks to Philo's Euhemerism. The second condition is much more difficult to meet.

"Kronos of the same name as his father" (Kronos jr.), has been so enigmatic that he has provoked no theories or comments. Apollo is a bit clearer. A Cypriot inscription identifies רשפ חץ and Apollo Amyklos.[139] Philo could thus have been thinking of Resheph when he wrote Apollo, but this does not solve the problem of locating Peraia.[140] A different clue is provided by Strabo who says that there was a sanctuary of Apollo at Borsippa, near Babylon.[141] This may be the Apollo

---

[137] Cf. Clemen, p. 74.

[138] One of the more famous was the Southeast corner of Asia Minor which is known as the "peraia" of Rhodes.

[139] KAI 39, line 3. On Resheph see Teixidor BES 1969, # 85 & 86, pp. 337-339 and BES 1970, # 68 & 69, pp. 369-370.

[140] On Resheph see Albright, YGC, pp. 139-140.

[141] Strabo 16,1,7. See also Lagrange, p. 388.

XUM

Philo intended but there is no proof. By Philo's time there were cults of Apollo all over Syria.[142] Zeus Belos was identified by Williams, following Clemen, as Babylonian Bel.[143] But the deity's name, like names of the Greek gods, had long been given to many local Syrian deities, above all to one of the major gods of Palmyra.[144] To conclude, there is not enough information about the gods to localize Peraia beyond doubt. Philo's territorial references are, however, usually close to home. Of all the possibilities the best identification would therefore be the Syrian townlet mentioned by Stephanus.

811:7-8 kata - pais.

Of the three "mortals" introduced in these sentences as contemporaries of Kronos' Peraian children, Pontos and Typhon seem to form a pair while Nereus is introduced as father of Pontos and son of Belos (presumably Zeus Belos). Nereus--or at least the phrase describing him--thus seems an addition. Further it creates a difficulty, since it represents at least Pontos as a grandson of Zeus Belos, with whom he was presented as contemporary. If original it probably indicates sloppy excerpting, either by Eusebius (of Philo) or by Philo (of his sources).

Pontos and Nereus form a pair in Greek mythology and should therefore be considered together. The Greeks made Pontos the father of Nereus,[145] while Philo has Nereus as father of Pontos. Due to his name, Pontos is an obvious candidate for equation with Ugaritic Yam, an equation proposed by Eissfeldt.[146] Yet there is another character in the fragments who might also have been equated with Yam, Poseidon of 811:10. Lokkegaard reserved Yam for Poseidon and therefore tried to discover some other equation for Pontos. (This was unnecessary; a single Semitic deity might, in different places, be identified with different Greek gods and vice versa.) Lokkegaard hesitantly suggested that Pontos and Nereus might be Ugaritic Madid and Nahar.[147] I cannot find a mdd in Gordon with the proper sense, but perhaps Lokkegaard intended mdb which exists in Ugaritic and has the required meaning, "flood or ocean."[148] This meaning, however, is inferred from one passage in which mdb//ym.[149] Mdb may therefore not be independent, and may differ from Ym no more than Aliyn from Baal. Similarly Nahar in Ugaritic is not independent but "an alternative name of the god Yam."[150] How far the multiplicity of names indicates cultic or conceptual differences - either in native Greek culture or in Ugaritic or in the amalgam of Philo's own time it is almost impossible to tell. At most we may recognize that Philo's profusion of names for sea deities is matched by that of Ugaritic poetry, but may be explained by a conflation of several local traditions. Poseidon, for example, is explicitly identified as the god of Beirut (812:13) while in this section we seem to have the pantheon of Byblos. Ugaritic Yam can therefore be identified

---

[142] Beirut: Hill, BMC Phoenicia, p. liv; Sidon, ibid., p. cxiii; Tyre, ibid., p. cxxxiii.

[143] Williams, p. 177; Clemen, p. 74.

[144] Seyrig, "AS 93," pp. 85ff. See also "AS 30," p. 302.

[145] See e.g. Rose, Handbook, p. 25.

---

[146] Eissfeldt, T. und S., pp. 27-28.

[147] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 73.

[148] mdd in Ugaritic means to measure; See Gordon, UT, # 1427, pp. 430-431. Perhaps mdd in Lokkegaard's article is therefore a typographical error for mdb, Gordon, UT, # 1425, p. 430, which has the proper sense.

[149] Gordon, UT, 52:34. [150] Ibid., # 1623, p. 442.

XUM

with Pontos, and Demarous' conflict with Pontos can reflect that of Baal with Yam.[151]

Lokkegaard is more successful with Typho. Typho of Greek mythology is some sort of terrible dragon, perhaps a sea monster, of oriental origin.[152] Ugarit has taught us of the famous monster enemies of Baal, the *tnn* and the *bṯn ʿqltn*.[153] The proper name of the latter monster is *ltn*.[154] West and Williams both see the Near Eastern parallels to Typho in Hittite and Hurrian myth,[155] but Lokkegaard points to the Ugaritic material and opens the possibility of seeing Typho as a metamorphosis of the Ugaritic monsters.[156] However any connection between Typho and the Ugaritic monsters must explain one important difficulty: in Greek mythology Zeus fights Typho himself. Anat fights the Ugaritic monsters for Baal. The identification is therefore only possible, not certain.

811:9-10 *apo de - Poseidon*.

Sidon is almost certainly the eponymous goddess of the city. As such her descent from Pontos would be comprehensible.[157] Why she discovered unaccompanied hymns[158] is unclear; perhaps the city was once

---

[151] See above, pp. 232-235.

[152] See e.g., Williams, pp. 9-26. For Typho as a sea monster, see Williams, p. 17.

[153] Gordon, *UT*, ʿnt:III:37-38.

[154] *Ibid*., 67:I:1. See also Ginsberg ap. *ANET*, p. 139, n. 10. For the now obvious connection of these monsters with Isa. 27:1 see Cassuto, *Anat*, pp. 39-40.

[155] Williams, pp. 23-25; West, *Theogony*, pp. 18-21.

[156] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 73.

[157] *Ibid*.

[158] See Du Cange, *Glossarium*, s.v. ᾠδή.

XUM

famous for its singers or choirs.[159]

Poseidon is for Philo the god of Beirut (812:13), and here Philo certainly reflects the local mythology of his time; the god is represented on numerous Beirutian coins.[160] The gods of both Sidon and Beirut thus appear in this Byblian section of the fragments. Their relative insignificance may not be accidental.

811:10-11 tōi de - Hēraklēs.

Philo makes the usual identification, attested (if not invented) by Herodotus, of Melqart and Greek Herakles.[161] Herodotus and Phoenician sources also establish the importance of Melqart for the Tyrians.[162] The meaning of Melqart's name was one of the earliest facts in the fragments to be established: Bochart already realized that Melqart was מלכקרת , "King of the City."[163] Melqart is therefore a title and not the god's proper name.

An important passage in Menander cited by Josephus speaks of the Tyrian festival of the awakening of Herakles(=Melqart).[164] This passage, as Baudissin realized, indicates that Melqart must be some sort of dying and reviving god.[165] Another line of argument, developed by

---

[159] See Williams, p. 177. Traces of the musical fame of Sidon are virtually impossible to find. Juvenal, Sat. 3, 62-65 speaks of the fame of Syria as a whole, while Theopompus FGrH 115 F 114 speaks of the dissolute life of the Sidonian court, including singing and dancing girls.

[160] See Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Berytus, # 1-5 and many others.

[161] Hdt. 2,44. See also KAI 47, a bilingual inscription to Melqart (in Phoenician) and Herakles (in Greek).

[162] See KAI 47. [163] Bochart, p. 709. [164] FGrH 783 F 1.

[165] Baudissin, Adonis, p. 172; See Smith, "Aretalogies," p. 185 and n. 79 for later discussions.

Albright, shows that Melqart was a god of the Resheph or Nergal type, that is when he is called "King of the City," the title means "King of the Underworld City."[166] Albright summarizes both these aspects of the god by concluding that as god of the underworld Melqart was "at the same time a chthonic deity, that is, he was lord of the ground and of its productive faculties."[167] This interpretation is beautifully confirmed by a text Albright never cites - the Baalu treaty. Melqart is there mentioned together with Eshmun. They will punish the treaty breaker by destroying his land, enslaving his people, and depriving him of food, clothing and oil.[168] The curses assigned to a god are obvious clues to his functions, and the curses in the Baalu treaty fit the functions Albright has attributed to Melqart.

811:11-13 eita palin - ēuxato.

This passage may reflect the wars of Baal and Yam of Ugaritic myth, as was argued above, p. 232.[169]

811:13-19 etei de - chōrion.

After thirty-two years of warfare Ouranos is finally killed by Kronos. Philo's account resembles Hesiod in important points. Ouranos is castrated in both versions, and even if the details differ, both authors tell of the special properties of the blood of Ouranos' genitals; Hesiod speaks of the birth of Aphrodite,[170] while Philo

---

[166] Albright, YGC, p. 128 and p. 137; Albright, "Hauron," pp. 10-12. Seyrig, "AS 39," pp. 69-74, reached the same conclusion from a different perspective, that of the monuments.

[167] Albright, ARI, p. 79. Cf. Dussaud, "Melqart," pp. 205-230 and KAI Vol. 2, p. 53.

[168] Baalu treaty, lines 14-18, ANET Suppl., p. 98.

[169] See also Albright, YGC, p. 133.

[170] Hesiod, Th., 190ff.

XUM

describes the red waters of the rivers into which the blood dripped, a place which seems to have been a tourist site.

The site is famous as the place where Ouranos died. Perhaps it was also famous because the waters still become red periodically. I find this interpretation attractive because the scene of action in this section of the fragments is twice specified as Byblos (809:15 and 810:13) and Philo is certainly retelling Byblian myths here; Byblos had a famous river nearby--Nahr Ibrahim--which ran red at certain times of year.[171] The emphasis on the dripping blood into the rivers is an allusion to the famous red waters of Nahr Ibrahim. For Philo the castration of Ouranos must be the myth which explains the redness of the river: given the special nature of the blood which dripped into the waters they become red periodically.[172]

811:20-23 tosauta - eudaimonias.

These lines have been assigned sometimes to Philo, sometimes to Eusebius, but are obviously by the latter, being a sneer at pagan mythology, so Bunsen, Clemen, and Mras.[173]

Two minor points remain. The words πρῶτον χρύσεόν τε γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, "the first and golden race of articulate men," are an echo from Hesiod.[174] I have taken the next phrase, τῆς μακαριζομένης ἐκείνης τῶν παλαιῶν εὐδαιμονίας, as a genitive of exclamation, as suggested by Mras.[175]

---

[171] Clemen, Lukian's Schrift, p. 34.

[172] Lucian, while visiting Byblos, learned a different Byblian myth explaining the red waters: the waters become red from the blood of the wounded Adonis, Syr.D. 8. Lucian's version must be that of a different Byblian temple than the one from which Philo's was derived. Cf. Baudissin, Adonis, p. 125.

[173] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 835; Clemen, p. 29; Mras, Praeparatio Evangelica, Vol. 1, p. 49. Cf. Williams p. 108. These lines are very similar to Eusebius' summary and comment which follow the cosmogony.

[174] Hesiod, Op. 109.

iv

Philo's account of Kronos, as he would have us read it, is of the life of a mortal. The original version, as we have seen, was a myth, perhaps, like Hesiod's myths of Kronos, a cosmogony by succession.[176] Philo's account is also based on Byblian mythology as opposed to the Tyrian myths discussed in the previous chapter. We have then in the fragments three parallel cosmogonies: one of unknown provenance, one of Tyre and one of Byblos. The Byblian myth went on to tell in detail of the wars of Kronos, wars similar to those of Hesiod's Kronos. Throughout the commentary on these fragments, aspects of Philo's story have been noted as disturbing from either a Phoenician or Greek point of view. These aspects should provide good clues for evaluating the claims and theories Philo proposes and for analyzing the relationship between Philo's story and Hesiod's.

---

[175] See the critical apparatus in Mras ad loc.

[176] See K & R, pp. 34-37.

CHAPTER NINE

i

Kronos and his party have won the war against Ouranos. As victors they divide the spoils, the rule of various parts of the world. As narrated by Philo, the "mortal" Kronos will assign countries to his "mortal" allies. These passages, as Eissfeldt first realized,[1] are very similar to Deut. 32:8-9 which, as it now stands, tells how Elioun divided up the nations according to the number of the "Children of Israel," בני ישראל. The Septuagint renders the latter phrase ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, suggesting that its Hebrew text read בני אל or בני האלהים.[2] This reading has been confirmed by a text from Qumran which reads בני אל[.[3] The entire verse would therefore be: בהנחל עליון גוים בהפרידו בני אדם יצב גבולות עמים למספר בני אל. This makes much better sense than the version of the Massoretic text: the verses explain how when Elioun divided up the nations he assigned a god to each and YHWH received Israel.[4]

A second set of passages to be considered in this chapter contain

---

[1] Eissfeldt, T. und S., p. 45, n. 1.

[2] ἄγγελοι in the LXX can render Hebrew בני האלהים, e.g. Gen. 6:2(A); Job 1:6; Job 38:7.

[3] See Skehan, "Song of Moses, Qumran," p. 12.

[4] I follow the excellent discussion of Rofé, Emunah Bemalachim, pp. 66-69. Cf. Hesiod, Th. 885 where Zeus distributes honors after his victory.

Philo's theory explaining the similarities between his stories and those of the Greek poets. Philo believes that he has presented the original version of the stories, a version later brought to Greece, embellished and expanded. Philo argues that the readers of his time have become so accustomed to these later incorrect expansions of the original that they no longer accept the true account. In commenting on these passages I hope to evaluate Philo's theory and attempt to discover and demonstrate the true relationship between Philo's material and the Greek stories.

ii

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Eusebius)

(811:23) And again the author, after other [things], adds to these [stories], saying:

(Philo)

(811:24) Astarte the Greatest, and Zeus Demarous, and Adad King of the Gods ruled the country with Kronos' consent. Astarte placed upon her own head, as a mark of royalty, the head of a bull. (812:1) And, wandering the world, she found a star fallen from the air, which she picked up and consecrated in the holy island of Tyre. (812:3) Astarte, the Phoenicians say, is Aphrodite. (812:4) And Kronos too, going about the world, gives to Athena, his daughter, the dominion over Attica. (812:6) But when there was pestilence and death Kronos gives his beloved[5] son to

---

[5] Monogenēs here cannot mean "only begotten," since it is clear both from the preceding genealogy and from the following story that Kronos had many sons. So the word must have its well-attested later

Ouranos, his father, as a wholly burned offering. He also circumcizes his [own] genitals and forced the allies with him to do the same. (812:9) And not much later, when another child of his dies--a son of Rhea named Mouth--he sanctified him. And the Phoenicians call this one Death and Pluto. (812:11) Following these [events] Kronos gives the city Byblos to the goddess Baaltis, who is also [called] Dione. And [he gives] Beirut to Poseidon and to the Kabeiroi and Agrotai and Halieis, who consecrated the remains of Pontos in Beirut. (812:15) Prior to all this the god Taautos, having imitated the appearances of the assembled gods--of Kronos, and Dagon and the others--formed the sacred figures of the letters. (812:18) He also devised for Kronos symbols of royalty--four eyes, front and rear, [two of them awake] and two quietly closed; also four wings on his shoulders, two as if flying and two as folded. (812:21) And this was a symbol, inasmuch as Kronos, when sleeping, kept watch, and waking, took his repose. (812:23) And in [the case of] the wings similarly, because while resting he flew, and flying he rested. (812:24) For each of the remaining gods [he made] two wings on their shoulders, inasmuch as they flew together with Kronos. (812:26) And for him, again, he made two wings in his head, one indicating his mind which was most fit to command, and the other indicating his sensation. (812:27) And when Kronos went to the land of the south he gave all Egypt to the god Taautos, that it should be a kingdom for him. (812:29) These things, he says, the seven sons of Sydyk, the Kabeiroi, and their eighth brother Asklepios were the first of all to record, as the god Taautos ordered them.

---

meaning, "beloved." See Lampe, Patristic Lexicon, s.v., no. 2 (and contrast the apologetic argument by Buchsel, "Monogenes," pp. 737-741).

(813:4) All these things Thabion--who was the very first of all the Phoenicians from the beginning to be a hierophant--allegorized and confused with physical and cosmic events and handed on to the members of religious organizations and to the prophets who founded mysteries. (813:7) And these, intent on increasing the humbug by every [means], passed [them] on to their successors and converts, of whom one was Syrios,[6] the discoverer of the three letters, brother of Chna whose name was changed[7] to Phoenix.

(Eusebius)

(813:11) Then he again continues afterwards:

(Philo)

The Greeks, outstripping all [other men] in cleverness first appropriated most [of the stories], and then wrote them up with various embellishments in tragic style and, intending to charm [people] with the pleasures of the myths, decked them out in every way. (813:14) Hence Hesiod and the famous Cyclic poets fashioned theogonies, and gigantomachies, and titanomachies of their own, and castration stories. And traveling about with these they completely defeated the truth. (813:17) Our ears, having grown up with their forgeries and having been captured many ages in advance, guard as a deposit, as I said at the beginning, that mythology they have received, which (813:20) aided by time has made its hold difficult to escape, so that the truth seems nonsense and

---

[6] I read ὧν ἦν καὶ εἷς Σύριος as suggested by Bunsen. See the discussion in the commentary *ad loc*.

[7] I omit πρώτου, adopting the reading of MS. A. See the discussion in the commentary *ad loc*.

XUM

the falsity of the narrative, truth.

(Eusebius)

(813:23) Let these passages be quoted from Sanchuniathon's work which was translated by Philo of Byblos and was approved as true by the testimony of Porphyry the philosopher.

iii

811:24-25 Astartē - gnōmēi

Kronos=El supervises or controls the division of the world much as Elioun (=El?)[8] in Deut. 32:8. Kronos' authority, it would seem, is not challenged, but, at most, voluntarily handed on to successors of his own choosing. There is no account in the extant fragments of a younger god arising to contest Kronos' position.[9] This is an obvious difference between Philo's stories and Hesiod: Philo has no one to play the role of Hesiod's Zeus.

According to the reading of the MSS. Kronos approved the rule of three persons: Astarte, Zeus Demarous, and Adad King of the Gods. We have seen above, however, that there are good grounds for thinking Demarous a god of the Hadad type.[10] The kai between Demarous and Adad should be emended to ho kai.[11] The highest rulers of the world are

---

[8] If the Elioun in Deut. 32:8 stands for El, then El is the distributor in both Philo and the Bible. On Elioun=El see Chapter Eight, pp. 218-221.

[9] See Walcot, Hesiod, p. 24 and Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 385. A similar relationship between El and Baal may be present in the Ugaritic epics. Thus Baal exercises the immediate authority in the divine world, yet certain (important?) decisions must be referred to El. See Pope, El, pp. 27-35.

[10] See Chapter Eight, pp. 232-235. [11] Ibid.

XUM

therefore Kronos, Astarte, and Zeus Demarous=Hadad.[12]

Astarte is the only one of these gods not to have been discussed in detail.[13] Philo will give more information about her in 811:25-812:4. For the moment it is sufficient to note, with Lokkegaard, that the epithet *megistē*, "the Greatest," is probably a translation of Phoenician רבת,[14] a title applied to Astarte in many inscriptions.[15] As Astarte is known to have been worshiped in at least Tyre, Sidon, Cyprus, and Carthage, Philo could have been referring to any or all of these cults.[16]

811:25-812:1 *hē de-taurou*.

One of the concerns of this section of the fragments will be to explain the various gods' symbols which Philo has Euhemerized into "marks of royalty" of the various mortals. In at least one case, that of Kronos=El, Philo's description can be confirmed by other evidence.[17] Astarte's "mark of royalty" is the head of a bull. This is not easy to identify, but it may be Philo's interpretation of the horns and/or a cow's ears worn by numerous female figures on ancient Phoenician stelai and decorative objects; the connection with the motif of "traveling about the world" makes it likely that he had in mind the legend of

---

[12] These three gods form a trinity, a theological institution characteristic of the Phoenician religion in later antiquity. See Seyrig, "AS 83," pp. 25-26.

[13] For Kronos and Demarous see Chapter Eight, pp. 225; 237-239; and pp. 232-235.

[14] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 74.

[15] See e.g. KAI 17, line 1; 33, line 3; 81, line 1.

[16] For Tyre see KAI 17 and the Baalu treaty, line 18; Sidon KAI 14; Cyprus, KAI 33; Carthage, KAI 81.

[17] See the discussion pp. 264-266.

XUM

Io-Isis-Hathor.[18] Another indication of the accuracy of Philo's description may be the place name עשתרת קרנים in Gen. 14:5.

812:1-3 *perinostousa - aphierōse*.

Philo is presumably playing with etymologies when he connects Astarte with a star (*astēr*).[19] He is now describing Tyrian Astarte: the star was taken to Tyre and consecrated there. Accordingly he associates Astarte with Kronos=El and Demarous; she was associated with Baalshamem and Melqart at Tyre.[20] We may have here another example of Philo's combining information from several cities in his work.[21]

The star "fallen from the air" which Astarte found must have been a meteorite. This statement of Philo's may be confirmed by numismatic evidence. An ovoid object, perhaps a meteorite, may be represented in its portable shrine on several Tyrian coins of the third century A.D.[22]

812:3-4 *tēn de - legousi*.

Philo, as usual, identifies the equivalent Greek and Phoenician gods: Astarte is Aphrodite. This identification, as Orelli realized, was common in antiquity.[23] Given the beliefs about the goddesses it is understandable.

---

[18] See Pritchard, *ANEP*, # 470, 471, 474, 475, 477 and *Supplement* # 829. On Io-Isis-Hathor see Höfer, "Io," cols. 263-270; 278-279.

[19] See Baudissin, *Studien*, I, p. 26.

[20] See Seyrig, "AS 83," pp. 19-20. Baalshamem, Melqart and Astarte appear in the Baalu treaty, thus confirming Seyrig.

[21] Cf. Chapter Seven, pp. 210-212.

[22] See Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Tyre, # 435 and 471. See also Seyrig, "AS 83," p. 22.

[23] Orelli, p. 36, n. 95.

XUM

812:4-5 kai ho - basileian.

This passage both supports a theory I have adopted and requires me to modify it. My theory was that Philo intended Ugaritic (and Cypriot?) Anat when he wrote Athena.[24] Athena is here specified as Kronos' daughter rather than Zeus', indicating that Philo is not thinking of the Greek goddess.[25] The specification would suit Ugaritic Anat, the daughter of El.[26] But Athena's rule over Attica indicates that Philo is thinking of the Greek goddess too. We have therefore a case of syncretism. Identification of Anat with Athena has produced a deity with the name of the latter and some characteristics of both. Further evidence of this syncretism can be found in the fact that Athena at Corinth is called Phoenician by a late source.[27] Whether she was actually Phoenician or Greek in origin,[28] her Corinthian title might have suggested to Philo or his sources that at Athens she was of Phoenician origin.[29] Philo's assigning Attica to Athena may therefore be another example of his claim that everything Greek was originally Phoenician (813:4-22) rather than an indication that he is thinking in Greek terms.

812:6-9 loimou - exanagkasas.

---

[24] See Chapter Eight, pp. 229-230 and p. 230, n. 68.

[25] See however Rose, Handbook, p. 108; Röscher, Lexicon, I, 676. Zeus' paternity of Athena was not unchallenged in Greece.

[26] See Kapelrud, Baal, p. 64.

[27] Schol. Lyc. Alex. 658. Cf. Farnell, Cults, Vol. 1, pp. 277ff. on other Phoenician elements in the cult of Athena at Corinth.

[28] See the discussion in Will, Korinthiaka, pp. 143-145, repudiating Farnell's conjecture, and adding other--and more important--evidence for Phoenician elements which, however, he rejects.

[29] Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine," p. 152.

XUM

Child sacrifice, which is to play an important role in the extant fragments (813:26-814:17) and which must have been equally important in the entire work (813:28-814:2),[30] is here discussed for the first time. Child sacrifice was well known in Phoenicia, and practiced in Africa down to Philo's own day.[31] Philo reports (the origin of ?) this rite in our passage and says that the practice was used by Kronos in an offering made to his father Ouranos at a time of pestilence and death. That pestilence and death should have been thought to have followed Ouranos' murder and that the sacrifice was conceived as an atonement are likely, but not stated. An unatoned murder can lead to curses, pestilence, drought and death. To cite one Ugaritic example, Danel curses the land with seven years of drought after the death of Aqhat.[32] In the Bible, the ritual prescribed in Deut. 21:1-9 is surely intended to prevent similar misfortunes.[33]

Although Philo does not say so, he probably understood the sacrifice of the child as a substitutionary atonement for Kronos.[34] Rather than Kronos dying for his crime against Ouranos, the child is sacrificed. Kronos' circumcision and his imposition of this practice on his "allies" is to be similarly understood.[35] By application of lex talionis Kronos should suffer castration. As an attenuated form of punishment Kronos circumcized himself and forced his allies to do likewise. Herodotus informs us that the Phoenicians practiced circumcision,[36] and Philo is probably attempting to explain the origins of this practice through the story of Kronos.

---

[30] Williams, pp. 180-181 minimizes the importance of child sacrifice in the entire Phoenician History in spite of Porphyry's explicit testimony.

[31] See Chapter Four, pp. 55-57.

[32] Gordon, UT, I Aqht:42-46.

[33] See Von Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 135-137. Rashi's remarks on Deut. 21:4 suggest that he (or his sources) understood the ritual similarly. Rashi writes: תבא עגלה בת שנתה שלא עשתה פירות ותערף במקום שאינו עושה פירות לכפר על הריגתו של זה שלא הניחוהו לעשות פירות I have long suspected that had Rashi been a folklorist he might have added something like לכפר על האדמה כדי שהאדמה תעשה פירות.

[34] See Frazer, Golden Bough, pp. 140-141.

812:9-11 kai met' - onomazousi.

This is a repetition of the events narrated in 811:2 with little added in the repetition. The new facts are that the boy was named Mouth, was consecrated after his death, and was called by the Phoenicians "Thanatos" (Death) and "Pluto."

Orelli was the first to recognize that Mouth must be a transliteration of Hebrew מות .[37] We now know that the word exists in Phoenician[38] and Ugaritic, and that a Ugaritic god of that name plays an important role in the epics.[39] Ugaritic Mot was the god of the netherworld, Baal's opponent, a god with a voracious appetite who swallows Baal but is later beaten by Anat.[40] The Phoenicians of Philo's time evidently understood their traditional pantheon correctly when they translated the name as Death and equated Mouth with Greek Pluto. The transliteration Mouth reflects the pattern of Hebrew (and Phoenician)

---

[35] I follow the suggestion of Lagrange, p. 392, n. 2. Cf. Gen. 17:23-27 where Abraham circumcizes not only himself and Ishmael but also ילידי ביתו.

[36] Hdt. 2, 104. [37] Orelli, pp. 37-38, n. 98.

[38] מות as a verb appears in several Neo-Punic inscriptions, e.g. KAI 128, line 3 and 136, line 2.

[39] See Gordon, UT, # 1443, p. 431.

[40] See Kapelrud, Baal, pp. 117-125.

XUM

ת becoming θ in the Septuagint.[41]

812:11-13 kai epi - didōsi.

In the division, Byblos was given to Baaltis or Dione. Baaltis must be a transliteration of the title בעלת, or in fuller form בעלת גבל, a Byblian goddess well known from the inscriptions.[42] The significance of the identification with Dione is uncertain, an uncertainty due largely to the lack of evidence.

812:13-15 Bēryton - aphierōsan.

Poseidon is here specified as the god of Beirut. As such he is probably the maritime god who rides a chariot drawn by four hippocamps represented on several Beirutian coins.[43] But Poseidon is not the only ruler of Beirut according to Philo. The Kabeiroi, Agrotai and Halieis share the task. Gruppe and Clemen have seen a representation of this fact in a coin type, first known from the days of Elagabalus, which shows eight figures seated in a circle.[44] This coin, Gruppe and Clemen maintain, shows what Philo describes. This interpretation is likely but should be accepted with some caution as there is no proof that the coin and Philo are necessarily related to each other. Moreover, Philo has eight Kabeiroi (813:2) who with Poseidon would make nine, rather than eight as on the coin. Another thing to be noticed is the appearance here, in the Byblian story of Kronos, of the Agrotai (808:20) and Halieis (808:20)

---

[41] See Chapter Four, p. 45, n. 6.

[42] See KAI 5,6,7,10, and 11. She is properly introduced by emendation in KAI 4, line 3.

[43] Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Berytus # 1, and others.

[44] Gruppe, p. 377; Clemen, p. 72. The coin is Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Berytus, # 206-209.

XUM

and Kabeiroi (809:11) from the preceding genealogy, where the first two appear as sons of the founders of Tyre. Evidently these were important deities along the coast and each local genealogy had to account for them in its own way.

The consecration of the remains of Pontos at Beirut is an enigma. It sounds very reminiscent of the myths of Osiris, but the consecrator in the Osiris story is Isis and the locale Byblos.[45] Perhaps a similar tale involving Pontos and Poseidon was told at Beirut but this is pure conjecture.

812:15-17 *pro de - charactēras*.

Taautos' invention of writing is central to Philo's chain of tradition, discussed in Chapter Five. It is this invention which will make Taautos the first reliable source of Philo's history. The system of writing is here again explicitly alphabetic, but it has some connections with picture writing as the letters are images of the faces of the gods.[46] The Egyptians did have an alphabet in which some of the signs were pictures, and perhaps this is what Philo meant.[47]

812:18-27 *epenoēse - aisthēseōs*.

Kronos too has a "mark of royalty" devised for him by Taautos, four eyes - two open,[48] and two shut - and four wings - one pair as if flying and the other folded. The symbolism of these eyes and wings is interpreted as meaning that Kronos was awake while resting and resting while awake, resting while flying and flying while resting. The other gods were clearly inferior, possessing only one set of wings. Kronos also had two wings on his head.

---

[45] See Plutarch, *De Iside*, 357A-D.

[46] The "assembled gods" in Philo looks like a rendering of Ugaritic *mpḫrt bn il* or *pḫr ilm* (Gordon, *UT*, 17:7 and 2:17 to note only a few passages), or of Byblian מפחרת אל גבל KAI 4, line 4.

[47] See Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, pp. 6-8 and pp. 25-29.

[48] The text is obviously incomplete. Jacoby's suggestion makes good sense.

Kronos=El who is represented in this manner is clearly different from the El of the Ugaritic texts whose epithet is *ṯr il*, "bull El."[49] Ugaritic monuments have also taught that this epithet was taken literally; El was represented as a bull.[50] Philo's Kronos=El must therefore be derived from a different tradition. Nor is this tradition hard to identify. Since at least the time of Lagrange, scholars have pointed to a nude figure with six wings who appears on some Byblian coins beginning in the Seleucid period.[51] These coins clearly present the sort of figure Philo was describing, so Philo's Kronos=El in this passage must be the Byblian version of the god (as we should have expected, since this section follows the Byblian theogony, in which Byblos is the first city founded in Phoenicia and is founded by Kronos, 810.14).

Note that Philo speaks of eyes and wings as "marks of royalty," though very few kings have four eyes or any wings at all. Presumably Philo has chosen these terms to impose his euhemeristic theory on the material. The four eyes and wings were common attributes of a deity. Compare the four eyes and four ears of Marduk which give him omniscience

---

[49] Gordon, *UT*, Krt:76-77. Pope, *El*, p. 35.

[50] See Schaeffer, "El et Baal," p. 9.

[51] Lagrange, p. 386. Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 350. For pictures of these coins see Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Byblos, # 12, 16(Plate XII,8) and others. A clearer picture in Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, p. 57. Four and six winged supernatural beings are fairly common, e.g. Isaiah 6:2; Ezechiel 1:6.

XUM

in the Enuma Elish 95-98.[52]

812:27-29 *elthōn - genētai*.

The journey of Kronos to the south is unexplained; perhaps it was invented to maintain his suzerainty over Egypt. The priority of Phoenicia to Egypt has hitherto not been stressed, but see Chapter Ten, p. 298.

Taautos received Egypt. I have rendered βασίλεον, as "kingdom," a meaning it can take in later Greek.[53]

812:29-813:3 *tauta - Taautos*.

Taautos, as Philo has consistently maintained, was responsible for recording these events.[54] We learn from this passage that his amanuenses were the seven sons of Sydyk, the Kabeiroi and their eighth brother Asklepios.

The fragments have already mentioned that Sydyk was the father of the Kabeiroi (809:11) and of Asklepios (811:5-6). The former report stands at the end of the Tyrian genealogy which leads to Sydyk; the latter report is inserted in the Byblian mythology where Sydyk suddenly appears without explanation, is related to nobody and plays no part in the story--perhaps he got in as spouse of the "Titanids" mentioned in the preceding lines. The two notices about Sydyk's offspring are completely different, if not contradictory, but are here reconciled by making Asklepios the eighth son. Asklepios was commonly identified with

---

[52] Translation in *ANET*, p. 62a.

[53] For *basileion* meaning kingdom see Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, s.v. *basileios* B4.

[54] See 804:25.

XUM

the Phoenician god Eshmun.[55] Eshmun's name, we know, was something of an enigma, but some connected it with the number eight (אשמן, שמן).[56] When Philo makes Asklepios the eighth brother he must have been thinking of Eshmun and adopting the interpretation of the name derived from the number eight.

A fragment of Damascius' _Vita Isidori_, whose relevance was already recognized by Orelli,[57] sheds much light on our passage.

> ὅτι ὁ ἐν Βηρυτῷ, φησίν, Ἀσκληπιὸς οὐκ ἔστιν Ἕλλην οὐδὲ Αἰγύπτιος, ἀλλά τις ἐπιχώριος Φοῖνιξ. Σαδύκῳ γὰρ ἐγένοντο παῖδες, οὓς Διοσκούρους ἑρμηνεύουσι καὶ Καβείρους. ὄγδοος δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Ἔσμουνος, ὃν Ἀσκληπιὸν ἑρμηνεύουσιν. οὗτος κάλλιστος ὢν θέαν καὶ νεανίας ἰδεῖν ἀξιάγαστος, ἐρώμενος γέγονεν, ὥς φησιν ὁ μῦθος, Ἀστρονόης θεοῦ Φοινίσσης, μητρὸς θεῶν. εἰωθώς τε κυνηγετεῖν ἐν ταῖσδε ταῖς νάπαις ἐπειδὴ ἐθεάσατο τὴν θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐκκυνηγετοῦσαν καὶ φεύγοντα ἐπιδιώκουσαν καὶ ἤδη καταληψομένην, ἀποτέμνει πελέκει τὴν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ παιδοσπόρον φύσιν. ἡ δὲ τῷ πάθει περιαλγήσασα, καὶ Παιᾶνα καλέσασα, τὸν νεανίσκον τῇ τε ζωογόνῳ θέρμῃ ἀναζωπυρήσασα θεὸν ἐποίησεν, Ἔσμουνον ὑπὸ Φοινίκων ὠνομασμένον ἐπὶ τῇ θέρμῃ τῆς ζωῆς. οἱ δὲ τὸν Ἔσμουνον ὄγδοον ἀξιοῦσιν ἑρμηνεύειν ὅτι ὄγδοος ἦν τῷ Σαδύκῳ παῖς.[58]
>
> The Asklepios in Beirut, he says, is neither Greek nor Egyptian, but rather a native Phoenician. For to Sadykos were born the children whom they interpret[59] as the Dioskouroi and the Kabeiroi. Eighth, after these, was born Esmounos, whom they interpret as Asklepios. Being the fairest in appearance and a young man worthy to view with admiration, he was beloved, so the story goes, by the Phoenician goddess Astronoe, mother of the gods. He was accustomed to hunt in these woodland glens; but when he saw the goddess hunting him, and following hard after him when he fled, and already about

---

[55] E.g. KAI 66. See Cumont, "Eshmun," col. 678 and Baudissin, _Adonis_, pp. 219-228.

[56] See the passage from Damascius just cited. Cf. Ugaritic _ttmnt_ whose name is usually explained (e.g. by Pope and Röllig, "Syrien," pp. 293-294) as derived from the number eight.

[57] Orelli, p. 39, n. 105. Baudissin, _Adonis_, pp. 339-345 also utilized this passage extensively.

[58] Damascius, _Vita Isidori Fragmenta_ (Ed. Zintzen), Frag. 348.

[59] ἑρμηνεύω=interpret, throughout this passage (with the exception of the final phrase) means _interpretatio Graeca_.

> to overtake him, he emasculated himself with an axe. Greatly distressed by his suffering she summoned Paian[60] and having rekindled the flame of life in the young man with her life-giving warmth she made him a god. He was named Esmounos by the Phoenicians with reference to the warmth of life. But some think Esmounos means the eighth, since he was the eighth child of Sadykos.[61]

The similarities between Damascius and Philo are numerous. Both speak of the Phoenician Asklepios=Eshmun, the son of Sadykos (Sydyk in Philo). Sydyk is unknown aside from these two texts. Moreover, Damascius specifies the sons of Sydyk as "Dioskouroi and Kabeiroi," in the same order as Philo in 809:11, and reconciles that passage with the report that Sydyk's son was Eshmun by making Asklepios=Eshmun the eighth son, in the same way as Philo (813:2). In addition, both Damascius and Philo know the explanation of Eshmun's name from the number eight, from the fact that he was Sydyk's eighth son. Finally, the Beirutian setting of Damascius' story properly disturbed Baudissin. Eshmun, as we know from inscriptions, was worshiped primarily at Sidon and there is no mention of a cult of Eshmun at Beirut.[62] Yet, Baudissin argues, Philo seems to share this disturbing feature as his Asklepios is the brother of the Kabeiroi who are among the "mortal rulers" of Beirut (812:13).[63]

---

[60] The meaning of this phrase is obscure. See Baudissin, Adonis, p. 237, n. 2.

[61] Translation after Edelstein, Asclepius, Vol. 1, pp. 423-424.

[62] Baudissin, Adonis, p. 214, 233, 340. The relevant inscriptions are KAI 14, line 17; 15; 16. Perhaps one should add Tyre on the basis of Punic KAI 66. The Baalu treaty, which mentions Eshmun (line 14) would confirm this suggestion. The numismatic evidence will be discussed in the following note.

[63] Baudissin, Adonis, p. 214, 233, 340. Gods with snakes appear on the coins of at least three Phoenician towns--Beirut, Carne and

Damascius was quite well read in Phoenician matters. It is, for example, thanks to him that the summaries of the cosmogonies of Mochos and of the Sidonians have been preserved.[64] While there is no evidence other than the above that Damascius had read Philo, the similarities in the above passages make the supposition likely. Therefore we must consider the possibility that in the story of Asklepios and Astronoe Damascius has retold an unrecognized fragment of Philo's Phoenician History. Moreover, if Damascius is quoting Philo another part of his account of Asklepios becomes intelligible. Two explanations of Eshmun's name are given, one as derived from the life giving warmth - as derived from Hebrew אש,[65] and Eshmun as derived from the number eight.[66] We know that Philo often discussed the alternate meanings of names in his work (807:26-808:2).

In spite of these similarities, it is impossible to prove that Damascius must have derived his information from Philo; he might have had a different Phoenician source. Moreover, Damascius' report that Asklepios, having died, was resurrected and made into a god by Astronoe,[67] is inconsistent with Philo's Euhemerism. Philo, I believe, would have

---

Sidon. See Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Berytus, # 215 (Elagabalus); Carne # 3 (221/0 B.C.); Sidon # 321 (Alexander Severus). If all these gods are Asklepios=Eshmun (as Hill believes) the Beirutian coin would confirm Philo and Damascius, and prove that Eshmun was worshiped at Beirut.

[64] See FGrH 784 F 4.

[65] This interpretation of Damascius was suggested by Baudissin, Adonis, p. 203.

[66] Baudissin, Adonis, pp. 214-215, believed that Damascius derived the explanation of Eshmun from the number eight from Philo.

[67] On Astronoe see Seyrig, "AS 83," pp. 19-21.

XUM

written that Astronoe consecrated the dead mortal Asklepios as a god.[68] This trait, however, may have been added by Damascius in his retelling of Philo's story.[69] In sum, the supposition that Damascius was using Philo remains likely but uncertain.

A passage of Pausanias is also relevant to Philo's statements about Asklepios.[70] Pausanias, Philo's younger contemporary, visited a shrine of Asklepios in Achaia. There he met an argumentative[71] Sidonian.

> ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τῷ ἱερῷ ἐς ἀντιλογίαν ἀφίκετο ἀνήρ μοι Σιδόνιος, ὁ ἐγνωκέναι τὰ ἐς τὸ θεῖον ἔφασκε Φοίνικας τά τε ἄλλα Ἕλληνων βέλτιον καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀσκληπιῷ πατέρα μὲν σφᾶς Ἀπόλλωνα ἐπιφημίζειν, θνητὴν δὲ γυναῖκα οὐδεμίαν μητέρα. Ἀσκληπιὸν μὲν γὰρ ἀέρα γένει τε ἀνθρώπων εἶναι καὶ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως ζῴοις ἐπιτήδειον πρὸς ὑγίειαν, Ἀπόλλωνα δὲ ἥλιον, καὶ αὐτὸν ὀρθότατα Ἀσκληπιῷ πατέρα ἐπονομάζεσθαι, ὅτι ἐς τὸ ἁρμόζον ταῖς ὥραις ποιούμενος ὁ ἥλιος τὸν δρόμον μεταδίδωσι καὶ τῷ ἀέρι ὑγιείας.
>
> In this sanctuary of Asklepios a man of Sidon entered upon an argument with me. He declared that the Phoenicians had better notions about the gods than the Greeks, giving as an instance that to Asklepios they assign Apollo as father, but no mortal woman as his mother. Asklepios, he went on, is air, bringing health to mankind and to all animals likewise; Apollo is the sun, and most rightly is he named father of Asklepios, because the sun, by adapting his course to the seasons, imparts to the air its healthfulness.[72]

When Pausanias' Sidonian said Asklepios he must have meant

---

[68] Philo habitually writes that dead mortals were consecrated by their survivors. See 806:1-5; 809:20; 812:9-10.

[69] If one believes that Damascius was reworking what he read in Philo (or some other Phoenician author) perhaps Asklepios' self castration too is adventitious. It certainly looks as if derived from the mythology of Atthis. See Baudissin, Adonis, p. 340.

[70] Baudissin, Adonis, pp. 221, 239, 245, 252, 342, began to see the significance of this passage.

[71] The attitude of the Sidonian and the sorts of claims he makes will be most important for our understanding of the intellectual climate in which Philo wrote, a topic reserved for the final chapter.

[72] Paus. 7,23, 7-8. Translation from LCL.

Eshmun, and made the same identification as Philo and the inscription.[73] This Sidonian interprets the gods and their functions in physical terms; Asklepios=Eshmun is the air, Apollo the sun. Philo disagreed vigorously with such interpretations (813:5-6). Nevertheless, one aspect of the Sidonian's speech agrees with what Philo writes. Asklepios=Eshmun's father, according to the Sidonian is Apollo=the sun. Philo has Sydyk as Asklepios' father, but Sydyk as we have seen is part of the pair Misor and Sydyk, a pair with important solar associations.[74] Thus both Philo and Pausanias' Sidonian make Asklepios=Eshmun's father a god associated with the sun.[75]

813:4-7 tauta panta - prophētais.

This passage, very similar to 805:4-19,[76] contains the history of the school of Philo's opponents. Thabion took the true accounts of Taautos, allegorized them, and mixed them with physical and cosmic processes and handed the distorted versions on to his followers.

Thabion has been generally recognized as a semitic personal name,[77] perhaps going back as far as Ugarit.[78] An interesting explanation of Thabion's name was proposed by Bernays, who saw the name as a transliteration of טביום. טביום, Bernays argues, is a semitic translation of Euhemeros, so that Philo's Thabion is the Euhemeros.[79] This explanation might be possible, were it not for the fact that Thabion is an allegorizer, one of Philo's opponents, and anything but a Euhemerist.

---

[73] So Baudissin, Adonis, p. 221.

[74] See Chapter Seven, pp. 207-209.

[75] The Sidonian's Asklepios is a god of health, for both men and animals. This may reflect the functions of Eshmun in the Baalu treaty, lines 14-17. Baudissin, Adonis, p. 342 was already close to this point. See also McCasland, "Religious Healing," pp. 27-32.

[76] See Chapter Five, pp. 92-93; 100-101 where the similarities are discussed and where the two sets of passages are analyzed as part of the well-known oriental reaction against the Greeks.

[77] Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 52, n. 1.

[78] See Dussaud, "Mythologie Phénicienne," pp. 377-388. PRU III 16.249, line 13.

In both 805:7 and 813:6-7 Philo maintains that religious associations and mystery cults were founded, based on the distorted versions of the myths. The fragments, unfortunately, do not specify which cults Philo had in mind.

813:7-10 hoi de-Phoinikos.

According to the reading of the MSS. one of those who eventually got the incorrect versions of the stories was Eisirios, the brother of Chna whose name was changed to Phoenix. Chna, as Bochart saw, must be כנען, and Phoenix must be Phoenician.[80] Eisirios' name is particularly difficult once one realizes the names of his brother. I have therefore adopted Bunsen's emendation of the passage: ὧν ἦν καὶ εἷς Σύριος, "one of whom was Syrios,"[81] Syrios, the Syrian, is a proper brother for Canaan or Phoenix.[82]

Syrios is "the inventor of the three letters," a particularly obscure phrase. No satisfactory explanation of the phrase had been

---

[79] Bernays ap. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 838, n. 9. TB Baba Batra 12b.

[80] The two names mean the same thing, purple. See DeVaux, "Canaan," p. 23 who follows Speiser, "Phoinikes," pp. 121-126.

[81] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 838, n. 10. Cf. Clemen, pp. 13-14.

[82] Cf. Dussaud, "Invention," p. 337.

XUM

offered prior to the discovery of the Ugaritic texts.[83] Eissfeldt, excited by the new insights offered by the Ugaritic myths, believed this old difficulty could also be resolved. Ugaritic seems to have three unusual letters, the three forms of aleph.[84] Eisirios, Eissfeldt suggests, is incorrect and should be *Ugr*, the eponymous hero of Ugarit. The three letters he discovered are then the three Ugaritic alephs.[85] Eissfeldt's suggestion is unacceptable on several grounds. Corruption of *Ugr* into Eisirios is incredible. The order in which Ugaritic scribes learned the alphabet indicates that only two of the alephs, *i* and *u*, were unusual.[86] Moreover, it seems unlikely that Philo's sources were so old that he could reflect a legendary explanation of this unusual aspect of Ugaritic. In all instances hitherto considered, whenever a Ugaritic passage explains or illuminates something in the fragments there has been an apparent gap, usually chronological, between Philo's information and Ugarit.[87]

One final proposal, that of Dussaud, should be considered. Dussaud suggests that τριῶν be emended to πρώτων.[88] The passage therefore discusses the invention of the first letters, and the emendation is not difficult since there are good grounds for suspecting πρώτου in 813:10 below. The difficulty with this suggestion is that it introduces a second inventor of writing, in addition to Taautos. Taautos seems to be the sole inventor of writing in the fragments. To conclude, it seems that a satisfactory explanation of the invention of the three letters remains to be found.

---

[83] See e.g. Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 839, n. 10.

[84] Gordon, *UT*, 3.1, pp. 11-15. [85] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 58-62.

[86] See Gordon *UT*, 3.1, pp. 11-12.

[87] See e.g. the discussion of El and Mot in Chapter Six, pp. 137-138; 142-144, and of Chousor in Chapter Seven, pp. 198-200.

[88] Dussaud, "Invention," p. 337.

The MSS. of the *P.E.* differ for 813:10. MSS. ONV all read τοῦ πρώτου μετονομασθέντος Φοίνικος, while MS. A omits πρώτου. Editors of the text have disagreed over the proper reading, with Gifford and Jacoby adopting the former reading, Mras and Williams the latter.[89] The reading of MS. A, omitting πρώτου, is clearly preferable. The word makes little sense and its presence can be readily explained as an insertion by analogy to 813:4-5 where Thabion is spoken of as πάμπρωτος τῶν . . . Φοινίκων .

813:11-22 *eith' - alētheian*.

In these lines Philo presents his theory to explain the relationship between his account of the wars of Kronos and Ouranos and the account in Hesiod and other Greek authors. He realizes that an attentive reader will have noticed both similarities and differences between his story and Hesiod's. Accordingly, he tries to explain both. What is similar is easy: Hesiod and the other Greeks learned versions of the Phoenician story (813:14-17). Hence the differences too become comprehensible. Hesiod learnt only a *version* of the truth, a version distorted by Thabion and his successors and further embellished by later Greeks (813:11-14; 17-22).

Philo's theory is suspect. Even if he himself was not responsible for the similarities between his story and Hesiod's, yet by his time Phoenicians had been reading Greek literature for several centuries and could have produced a text modeled on Hesiod.[90] Moreover, his explanation of the differences is part of the oriental reaction against Greek mythology and culture popular in his day.[91] As such, it may be rather propaganda than history. With these considerations in mind the detailed analysis of Philo's theory can begin.

---

[89] Jacoby: see the critical apparatus *ad loc*, similarly Mras and Gifford in their respective editions of the *P.E.* Williams, p. 115.

His assertion of Hesiod's dependence is based on similarities between the two stories. These similarities include the marriage of an earth goddess and the sky god, the castration of the sky god by his son who is allied with his mother against his father.[92] But these similarities are no proof that such stories were native to Phoenicia, told by Phoenicians, and not made up from Hesiod.[93]

Can other evidence for Philo's theory be found? First, there is the fact that Philo identifies Kronos with the Phoenician El. Ouranos and Ge are the pair *arṣ w šmm* or שמין וארק known from Ugaritic and the Sfire treaty respectively.[94] Philo's main characters are thus Phoenician; this argues for the Phoenician origin of the stories - though not very strongly; one would expect a Phoenician retelling to have a local cast.

Ugaritic mythology helps. The wars of Pontos and Demarous in Philo resemble the wars of Baal and Yam.[95] But in more important points

---

[90] West, *Theogony*, pp. 27-28 recognizes this obvious point. Cf. Walcot, *Hesiod*, pp. 17-18.

[91] See the discussion in Chapter Five, pp. 100-102.

[92] I shall discuss the Hittite texts later in this chapter.

[93] Many scholars who studied Philo during the nineteenth century held the opinion that the stories were simply made up from Hesiod.

[94] See Chapter Eight, pp. 222-224.

[95] See Chapter Eight, pp. 232-235.

Ugarit offers little to confirm the Phoenician origin of the story of Ouranos, Ge and Kronos.[96] Ugaritic El seems to have no predecessors, unlike Philo's El=Kronos. Philo has Elioun=Baal two generations older than El;[97] in Ugarit El is Baal's father. Finally, none of the Ugaritic myths known to us employs the castration motif in any way.[98]

However, in the first place, it cannot be supposed that our knowledge of Ugaritic mythology is complete; in the second place, Philo's account centers on Byblos and his Kronos=El is represented on Byblian coins. If his story is based on the mythology and pantheon of any Phoenician town it should be Byblos, not Ugarit. Perhaps Byblian mythology (otherwise totally unknown) differed from that of Ugarit. In Byblos El may have had some predecessors and the castration motif may have been used. This is unfounded conjecture, but possible.[99]

The differences between Philo and Hesiod argue for a Phoenician origin of Philo's story. Unlike Hesiod, Philo has an odd thirty-two year interval between Ouranos' deposition and castration, thirty-two years during which Ouranos attempts to regain his position.[100] Philo has no real equivalent of Hesiod's Zeus and Philo's Kronos is the actual ruler of the world.[101] The conflict between Ouranos and Ge originates for different reasons in the two authors.[102] Finally, there is much in Philo not to be found in Hesiod.[103] Had Philo made up his story from Hesiod we should not have expected such important differences.[104] Therefore Philo must have been following some non-Hesiodic tradition and in these circumstances it would seem most likely that this tradition was Byblian.

---

[96] A Ugaritic text discussed by Güterbock, Kumarbi, p. 112 equates El and Kumarbi. This does not necessarily mean that similar myths were told of both gods. The similarities which led to the identification might lie elsewhere. Cf. Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 385.

[97] See Chapter Eight, pp. 219-221.

[98] Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 399 invents the idea that the Baal of the Phoenician myth, "forces [El] to castrate self."

[99] Philo's El, after all, is not the Bull El of Ugarit, but the figure on Byblian coins as was discussed above.

[100] See Chapter Eight, pp. 227-228 and 250-251.

[101] Above, pp. 257-258.

Our first question is therefore answered. The stories Philo presents were told by Phoenicians of Byblos and were not simply made up from Hesiod by Philo or some other Phoenician. The Byblian tale may have been retouched by Philo or someone else to look more like Hesiod (a possibility to be discussed below), but in its essentials it is a native Byblian myth.[105]

What was the relationship of this Byblian myth to Hesiod? The two stories are not likely to be totally independent, they are too similar. The differences prohibit any direct dependence, whether of Philo on Hesiod or (as Philo claims) of Hesiod on Philo's sources. Nor can the differences be explained away as Philo attempts--as distortion by Thabion, his successors and the Greeks. There are no apparent motives for the specific differences, which might lead us to attribute them to Greek revisers, and the Greek story shows no traces of Phoenician origin.

---

[102] See Chapter Eight, pp. 226-227.

[103] See Chapter Eight, pp. 227-228.

[104] Cf. Plutarch, De Iside, 357A-C, obviously based on the Hymn to Demeter 98ff.

[105] West, Theogony, pp. 27-28 considered this the essential question to be answered concerning Philo's sources, and reached essentially the same answer though from somewhat different considerations and with minor reservations.

I suggest that Philo and Hesiod represent two versions of a common mythological theme of the eastern Mediterranean world, the theme of "Kingship in Heaven." Stories of the succession of divine kings were told by nearly all the peoples, with each nation telling a version in which their gods were the heroes. Philo and Hesiod preserve a Byblian and a Greek version respectively.

Other versions of this common theme are not hard to find. Hittite texts preserve the myth of Anu, a sky god, second in the list of divine rulers. Anu is castrated and deposed by his son Kumarbi who replaces his father as divine ruler. The other columns of the text are badly broken and certainty is impossible, but it seems that Anu attempts to regain his position with the help of the storm god. In the end Kumarbi loses, and is himself deposed by the storm god.[106] Another set of tablets continues this myth and tells how Kumarbi attempted to regain his former position by engendering a monster who challenged the storm god with some success at first but ultimately was defeated.[107]

The similarities between these Hittite myths and Philo are apparent. Both have the sky god, second in a list of four divine rulers, castrated by his son. In both the deposed sky god plots to regain his former position. There are, however, equally apparent differences: the method of castration is not the same, nor is the role of the fourth god equivalent--the Hittite storm god is much more active than Philo's Zeus Demarous. Zeus Demarous never challenges or replaces Kronos=El in anything like the manner in which the storm god challenges Kumarbi. Moreover, in spite of the mention of Typhon (811:8) Philo lacks the account of the challenge by a monster. Finally, the Hittite myth has no equivalent to Philo's Ge.[108]

---

[106] Text in ANET, pp. 120-121.

[107] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-125. Another version of this theme may be the Egyptian story of Seth and Horus, ANET, pp. 14-17. The Egyptian account, however, has only the theme in common and few details.

Comparing the Hittite version to Hesiod yields another set of similarities and differences. Hesiod and the Kumarbi stories share the motif of the castration of the sky god by his son, the subsequent divine wars and challenges, and the fight of the young weather god against a monster. Nevertheless, Hesiod has only three divine generations, his sky god does not actively seek to regain his lost status, and Hesiodic Ge has no equivalent. Finally, Walcot has argued that while Hesiod's Zeus is invincible, the Hittite weather god loses the first engagement.[109]

The final version of this theme to be considered is the Babylonian. The Enuma Elish tells the story of Apsu, Ea, Tiamat, Kingu and Marduk. A theme common to Hesiod, Philo, and the Kumarbi material is missing in the Enuma Elish--the castration of the sky god.[110] But Apsu is deposed by Ea. He vanishes from the scene and the text narrates at great length the defeat of Tiamat and Kingu by the young victorious god Marduk.

---

[108] See Walcot, Hesiod, pp. 24-25 for a similar analysis. West, Theogony, p. 27 says that Philo has no character to match Tiamat or Hesiod's Ge; this is clearly incorrect, given the role of Philo's Ge. Only the Hittite version lacks a female lead.

[109] Walcot, Hesiod, p. 26.

[110] Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 393 finds a castration episode in the Enuma Elish. He argues that Ea, before killing Apsu, "tears off the former's tiara or halo (symbolic, perhaps of sovereignty and the masculine vigor that accompanies it) and puts it on himself (Tablet I, lines 60-69). Admittedly we may be guilty of overinterpretation here, but it does occur to us that the act of tearing off Apsu's tiara is comparable to an act of castration."

XUM

The comparison of the four myths confirms the conclusions reached above. These stories have not simply been borrowed from one nation by the other. The differences are too marked and the characters too integrated in the mythology of each people. They are rather four versions of the common mythological theme of Kingship in Heaven.

Can the path by which this common theme spread be traced, that is can the filiation between the versions be established? This question is of some importance. If it could be established that the Phoenicians were the intermediaries through whom the Greeks learned the mythological theme, Philo's theory would be--to some extent--confirmed, albeit in a sense he never intended.

Güterbock has argued that the Phoenicians were the intermediaries through whom the Greeks learned the story.[111] Philo and Hesiod, Güterbock maintains, both have gods who are abstractions.[112] Philo and the Kumarbi stories share the list of four divine rulers. Philo's sources Güterbock concludes, were the means through which the Hittite stories reached Greece. This interchange would have taken place at Ras Shamra or at some similar place where the peoples came into contact during the second millenium B.C.

Güterbock's conclusion, though shared by other scholars,[113] overlooks much that separates the three accounts, as was shown above. None of the versions possesses the aspects necessary for identification as the intermediary between the other ones. Steiner, another student of the problem, has accordingly proposed a much more complex explanation of the relationships. He suggests that "the Enuma Elish was the immediate source of two intermediate albeit unattested versions labeled 'X' and 'Y.'[114] The 'Y' version ..... ultimately reached Greece and manifested itself in Hesiod's Theogony. The Hurrian-Hittite version reflects both the 'X' and the 'Y' versions, although the former would seem to be the most immediate source.... The 'X' version perhaps also gave rise to a third unattested version, 'Z', which together with the Hesiodic version is reflected in Philo's History."[115] What is significant for our purposes in Steiner's analysis is that Philo's story is not the intermediary through which the motif reached Greece. Also significant is Steiner's conclusion that Philo's version was based on Hesiod. If Steiner is correct Philo's contention is not even confirmed in the indirect sense we have been considering.

---

[111] Güterbock, Kumarbi, pp. 114-115.

[112] E.g. Philo's Misor and Sydyk or Hesiod's Chaos, Eros, Themis, Mnemosyne etc.

[113] Hölscher, "Anaximander," pp. 392-393; West, Theogony, pp. 28-30, regards this conclusion with much more caution.

Perhaps the most prudent approach is that taken by West and Barnett. Two versions of the "kingship in Heaven" theme--the Hittite and Phoenician--are only imperfectly known, a crucial section of the former preserved only on a badly broken text and the latter preserved only in outline. Given these facts and the numerous differences between the versions as we know them, any filiation or conclusive proof of how the theme reached Greece is difficult if not impossible.[116] West very

---

[114] The Babylonian origin of the basic theme is accepted by Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," pp. 396-400 and other scholars.

[115] Steiner, Sukzessionsmythos, p. 104, ap. Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 402, n. 35. I have not yet obtained a microfilm of Steiner's book and know it only from this summary.

[116] West, Theogony, p. 30.

XUM

tentatively suggests Ugarit as the point of contact, Barnett Cilicia.[117] Perhaps then, according to West, Philo was correct in a way, but in our current state of knowledge this conclusion is close to conjecture.

One question remains. Philo, in claiming that his story was Hesiod's source is also asserting that his story antedates Hesiod. Is this claim correct? Is the story as told by Philo a relic of the pre-eighth century somehow accurately preserved by Philo? Steiner clearly thinks Philo's version has been touched up to look more like Hesiod.[118] In view of the passages in Philo which seem to be derived from Hesiod this is a reasonable conclusion.[119] As we have seen Philo did not simply retell the myths as learned from the temples of his time or shortly before; for instance, as a good Euhemerist, he turned the deities into mortals. This the temples certainly did not. There is every likelihood that he modified or eliminated some stories that would not fit, at least remotely, his various theses. Earlier versions of his stories had certainly been told in Byblos during the second millenium. Perhaps these myths were somehow associated with the venerable name of Sanchuniathon, but Philo knew the contemporary or near contemporary versions, and rewrote these to suit his own theories.

What Philo has done, and how he utilized his sources is clear in the light of the discussion above. Philo knew a version of the "Kingship in Heaven" theme. He exploited the similarities between the version he knew and Hesiod in order to make the claim that Hesiod learned all from the Phoenicians--an example of the anti-Greek theories typical of Philo's age.

---

[117] Barnett, "Walcot," p. 152.

[118] See note 115. [119] See Chapter Eight, pp. 227-229 and 231-232.

813:23-25 tautą - martyrias.

The significance of this appeal to Porphyry has been discussed above, Chapter Four, pp. 59-60.

XUM

CHAPTER TEN

i

The fragments to be discussed in this chapter deal with child sacrifice and with snakes. These passages have, on the whole, less interested all commentators on Philo and accordingly have not been intensively discussed. The lack of interest is readily explicable: these fragments are not directly related to the central questions of the scholarly debate concerning Philo and his sources. Nonetheless, they have some interest.

ii

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Porphyry)

(813:26) The Phoenicians, too, in great disasters, whether of wars, or droughts, or plagues, used to sacrifice one of their dearest, dedicating him to Kronos. (813:28) And the *Phoenician History*, which Sanchuniathon wrote in Phoenician and which Philo of Byblos translated into Greek in eight books, is full of such sacrificers.

(Eusebius)

(814:3) Accordingly let these quotations from the aforementioned work suffice.[1] But from the first book of Philo's *Phoenician History*

---

[1] As Jacoby notes, the aforementioned work is Porphyry's *De Abstinentia*.

I shall cite the following:

(Philo)

(814:6) It was the custom of the ancients, when great dangers befell [them], that, to avoid complete destruction, the rulers of the city or the people should give over to slaughter the most beloved of their children as a ransom to the vengeful daimons. And those given over were slain with mystic[2] rites. (814:) Now Kronos--whom the Phoenicians call El and who ruled the land and later, after the end of his life was deified in the star of Kronos--had, by a native nymph called Anobret, an only son who was therefore called Ieoud (for an only son is thus called even now by the Phoenicians). (814:15) When on account of war, the greatest dangers seized the land, he adorned his son as if he were king and, having prepared an altar, sacrificed him.

(Eusebius)

(814:18) Observe what the same author again (translating "On the Phoenician Elements" from Sanchuniathon's work) says concerning creeping and venomous animals which serve no good end for men but work death and destruction to those in whom they inject their dangerous and painful poison. And he indeed writes, word for word, the following things, saying thus:

(Philo)

(814:23) The nature therefore of the snake and of serpents, Taautos himself regarded as divine, and after him, again, the Phoenicians and Egyptians [did so]. For he presented the animal as that of all the reptiles which contained most spirit and as being [of the nature] of fire. (814:26) Besides which he also attributes to it unsurpassable swiftness on account of the spirit, since it lacks feet and arms or any other of the outer limbs by means of which the other animals move. (815:1) And it makes the forms of various figures and when it moves it advances with spiral motions at whatever speed it desires. (815:3) And it is most long-lived, for it not only sheds its old skin and becomes young but also it is increased [by the process] and becomes bigger. (815:5) And when it has filled out the established measure [of age] it consumes itself, just as Taautos himself described in the sacred writings. (815:7) Therefore, too, this animal is taken into the temples and mysteries. (815:8) It has been discussed by us more fully in the treatises entitled Ethothion, in which it is established that the snake is immortal and that it is resolved into itself as was said above. (815:11) For the nature of this animal is such that it does not die unless it is struck by some violent force. (815:12) The Phoenicians call it Agathos Daimon. Similarly the Egyptians name it Kneph. (815:14) They attribute to it the head of a falcon on account of the falcon's activity. (815:15) And Epeeis (who was named by them as the greatest hierophant and sacred scribe and whom Areios of Herakleopolis translated into Greek) allegorizes as follows word for word:

---

[2] The choice between "mystic" and "secret" as renderings of mystikōs is discussed in the commentary ad loc.

(Epeeis _ap_. Philo)
(805:18) The first and holiest being is the serpent which has the form of a falcon and is very pleasing. If it looked forth everything in its birthplace was filled with light. And if it shut its eyes there was darkness.

(Philo)

[Thus] Epeeis, giving the impression that it is also fiery, because he says, "it shone through," for shining through is peculiar to light. (815:22) And Pherekydes, too, taking his beginnings from Phoenicians also theologized concerning the god he called Ophioneus and concerning the Ophionides of whom we shall speak later. (815:25) Moreover the Egyptians, from the same notion, when drawing the world engrave as the circumference an airy and fiery circle and stretched out in the middle a snake in the form of a falcon. (815:28) The whole figure looks like our [Greek] Theta. (815:29) Declaring the circle to be the cosmos, [they say] the snake in the middle is Agathos Daimon the connective [bond] of this [cosmos]. (815:30) And the Magus Zoroaster in the Sacred Collection of the Persian [Records] says, word for word:

(Zoroaster ap. Philo)

(816:1) And the god has a falcon's head. This is the first god, incorruptible, everlasting, unborn, indivisible, most incomparable, the controller of all good, unbribable, the best of good things, and the wisest of the wise. He is the father of good order and justice, self-taught, natural and perfect and wise and the sole discoverer of sacred nature.

(Philo)

(816:6) Ostanes says the same things about him in the [book entitled] Octateuch. (816:7) All [these writers] taking their beginnings from Taautos gave [serpents] physical interpretations as was stated above. (816:9) And having built temples, they consecrated in the adyta those first elements which the serpents represented and for these they cele-

XUM

brated festivals and offered sacrifices and performed secret rites, since they thought them the greatest gods and the rulers of all things. (816:22) This is what [Taautos says] concerning snakes.

(Eusebius)
(816:13) Accordingly, then, the content of Phoenician theology is of this sort, of which the saving word preaches that . . . we should flee it without turning back. And inasmuch as these things happen not to be myths and poet's fictions which contain some theory concealed in hints, but rather true testimonies, (as they [too] would say) of wise and ancient theologians which contain things older than all the poets and historians, (816:18) and which bring proof for their statements from the terminology and history of the gods which down until now prevails in the cities and villages of Phoenicia, and from the mysteries which are celebrated in each [of these cities and villages], (816:20) it should be clear that one should not seek out violent physical interpretations of these things since the facts themselves provide clear refutation [of such interpretations]. Such then, is the theology of the Phoenicians.

iii

813:26-814:3 Phoinikes - hērmēneusen.

Child sacrifice has already been discussed in the previous chapter (ad 812:6-7). This quotation from Porphyry adds several points not mentioned in that passage. Kronos' sacrifice of his son was offered at a time of pestilence and destruction (812:6). We now learn that such sacrifices were offered at other times of crisis, such as wars or droughts,

XUM

in addition to plagues (813:27).[3] A second fact added in this fragment is that the infants were offered to Kronos, which agrees with other evidence concerning this practice.[4] The description of the child offered as τῶν φιλτάτων τινά, "one of the most beloved," agrees with μονογενῆ υἱὸν, "a beloved son," of 812:6.[5] The last phrases of this passage are another explicit testimony to Philo's claim of having translated Sanchuniathon from Phoenician to Greek.

Before analyzing the other passage on child sacrifice, 814:3-17, one problem must be considered. Eusebius cites this passage twice: once in book four of the *P.E.* as coming from Philo's *Phoenician History* (814:3-17), and once in book one as from Philo's *Peri Ioudaiōn* (818:16). Was *Peri Ioudaiōn* a separate work of Philo's or was it a section of the *Phoenician History*? Origen refers to it as if it were an independent work (817:28-818:6) and this it probably was. Eusebius either got the reference wrong in one passage or the other, or else Philo cited or repeated himself in his *Phoenician History* or his work on the Jews. The latter possibility is not implausible, particularly if Philo was discussing child sacrifice in the Bible. Pagan anti-Christian authors compared Biblical stories with Greek mythology, and Philo might have done the same with Phoenician myths.[6]

---

[3] See II Kings 3:21-27. See also D.S. 20,14,4-6 and Moscati, *Phoenicians*, pp. 142-143.

[4] See the passage from D.S. cited in the previous note. But see also the comments on 814:6-9.

[5] See the commentary on 812:6.

[6] Gruppe, p. 365 considered it highly unlikely that Philo would have quoted the *Phoenician History* in an independent work against the Jews. I fail to see why it would be unlikely as Philo refers to his other books, e.g. the *Paradoxos Historia*, in the *Phoenician History*

XUM

814:6-9 ethos - daimosi.

The circumstances calling for child sacrifice are described here as "dangers," thus agreeing with the fuller list of 813:27 and with Phoenician practice.[7] The victim, as was noted above on 812:6, is the most beloved son, τὸ ἠγαπημένον τῶν τέκνων: agapētos and monogenēs are often used synonymously,[8] while Hebrew יחיד can mean both "only" and "beloved."[9]

One further important detail is added in this passage. Child sacrifice was not performed by all Phoenicians, and was not a substitute for exposure. Only aristocratic families, it seems, were required or expected to perform this rite.[10] With this conclusion the evidence of Philo agrees, specifying that τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἢ πόλεως ἢ ἔθνους sacrificed their sons.

To whom were these children sacrificed? Kronos' sacrifice in 812:6-7 was to his father Ouranos. Porphyry quotes Philo as saying that Kronos was worshiped with these sacrifices, while our passage is vaguer and speaks of the vengeful daimons. Perhaps the god to be honored or appeased by the sacrifice depended on the circumstances.

814:9-10 katesphattonto - mystikōs.

(805:20) and could well have cited one work in another. Cf. Clemen, pp. 2-3.

An example of a pagan anti-Christian author comparing Bible stories and pagan mythology is afforded by Celsus, Origen, Contra Celsum, 3.25. On this practice in general see Labriolle, Reaction Paienne, pp. 175-189.

[7] See note 3.

[8] See the commentary on 812:6.

[9] "Only" is, of course, the usual meaning. See BDB s.v. יחיד, p. 402. "Beloved" may be the sense intended in Prov. 4:3.

[10] See note 3.

Mystikōs can mean that the children were sacrificed "mystically," or "secretly." I have chosen the former as the rite described in 814: 16-17 seems to have been public, not secret, but might be called "mystic," - i.e. symbolic - as the boy was dressed up to look like the king.

814:10-17 Kronos - katethysen.

After the generalities on child sacrifice, one case is cited. Kronos=El offered his son Ieoud at a time of war.

The passage is quite specific as to the time in Kronos' "life" when the sacrifice took place. Kronos already "rules the land," that is he has already replaced Ouranos as king. We have seen above that there was a thirty-two year lapse between Kronos' acquisition of the kingship and the castration of Ouranos,[11] but Philo does not specify whether the sacrifice was before or after the latter event. The sacrifice of 812:6-7 is specifically placed after the castration of Ouranos. Moreover, the sacrifice of 812:6-7 was at a time of pestilence while that of 814 was at a time of war. Ergo, these were probably two different sacrifices. Philo's Phoenician History was not only full of the names of sacrificers (813:28-814:1) but one such sacrificer seems to have performed the rite twice. Perhaps Philo has combined accounts from two sources on Kronos' sacrifice of his son,[12] or perhaps one source contained stories of several sacrifices.

Kronos' sacrifice in wartime also deserves comment. Who was the enemy? Possibly Ouranos, but possibly some other mythological figure. This passes conjecture.

---

[11] See Chapter Eight, pp. 227-228 and p. 250.

[12] This would not be the first time Philo would be suspected of combining sources. See Chapter Seven, pp. 211-212.

XUM

Two semitic names appear in this passage, the nymph Anobret and Ieoud. Anobret, the mother of the victim, is otherwise totally unknown and the explanations of her name are unconvincing.[13] Ieoud is a problem of a different sort. MS. D reads Ieoud, while MS. A reads Iedoud, transliterations of יחיד and ידיד respectively. As Ieoud= יחיד is literally translated by *monogenēs* (814:13 & 14), it is preferable.

That the boy was dressed up as if he were king for the sacrifice indicates that this was a rite of substitution - the boy dying instead of the king. The same sense is doubtless to be understood in 812:6-7 where the child is offered to Ouranos, most probably as atonement. If Albright is correct about the meaning of the Moloch sacrifice, if that name was derived from מלך, and originally meant "kingdom or royalty,"[14] the costume as described by Philo is most appropriate.

That Kronos, "after the end of his life was deified in(to) the star of Kronos" (814:11-12),[15] need not imply that Kronos was "translated" into the star; I would rather take it as another specific example of the practice ascribed to the most ancient people in 806:6, that of giving the names of kings to the cosmic elements.[16]

iv

The section which follows, 814:18-816:12, is quite different

---

[13] See Williams, pp. 190-191. [14] Albright, *YGC*, pp. 240-242.

[15] Kronos'star is the planet Saturn on which see Bouché-Leclerq, *Astrologie Grecque*, pp. 93-97.

[16] The other example of this supposed practice would be the giving of the names of Ouranos and Ge to the sky and earth, 809:15ff.

XUM

from the other fragments. Its main subject is not "mortals," their deeds or inventions, but snakes. Eusebius, I believe, quoted this passage as a final argument for the foolishness of paganism. Eusebius and his readers think snakes are dangerous and noxious (814:20-22). But, Eusebius argues, look at the foolish pagans who consider snakes divine. How ridiculous![17]

814:18-22 *ho d' autos - legōn*.

Eusebius says the following quotation comes from the same author, i.e. Philo, translating Sanchuniathon's περὶ τῶν Φοινίκων στοιχείων. Leaving aside for the moment the question of what Φοινίκων στοιχείων means, is the entire phrase the title of a book (or chapter within a book) or is it simply Sanchuniathon's discussion of these questions? The choice is quite difficult, but Eusebius' wording suggests that the phrase is a title.[18] If a title, it is highly unlikely that it is the title of some "other" work of Sanchuniathon also translated by Philo. The probability is that this quotation comes from the *Phoenician History* and the title is that of a chapter or section of the work. As we shall see there is much within the quotation to confirm this conclusion; the passage has many connections with ideas developed in the other fragments.[19]

---

[17] Williams, p. 192 realized that this was the reason Eusebius cited the section on snakes.

[18] Williams, p. 120 is one of the scholars who does not take the phrase as a title.

[19] Gruppe, pp. 369-370 believed these fragments came not from Philo's pen, but from the works of some allegorizing author. Jacoby inclined to Gruppe's opinion and labeled the fragment dubious. This opinion is based on the fact that there are many allegorical and physiological interpretations of snakes in these lines. The detailed analysis of these fragments will show that Gruppe was partially correct--allegorical and physiological interpretations are offered, but are cited by Philo as part of his criticisms of opponents.

The title of the section, Φοινίκων στοιχείων, has been variously translated. Philo uses the word stoicheia in two senses in the fragments: it means "letters" in 809:7 and 812:17, and "elements" in 806:9 and 816:9. Given these attested usages it is not surprising that the title of the section has been rendered by some as "Phoenician Alphabet," by others as "Phoenician Elements."[20] Since stoicheia at the end of our passage, in 816:9, means "elements" it is most probable that it also means "elements" in the title of the section from which our passage was excerpted. Moreover, if stoicheia means "letters" there is little in the passage to justify that supposed title. The snakes make various figures while moving (815:1) and an Egyptian figure is like a Greek Theta (815:28), but these are asides, too incidental and trivial to have been the focal point of the original section. The passage ends, however, with the mention that for some, snakes represented the elements (816:9). In that sense therefore an account of the "Phoenician Elements" (or perhaps better, "The Elements according to the Phoenicians") would properly consider snakes. For these reasons I have rendered the title of the section as "On the Phoenician Elements."[21]

In order to understand the quotations from Philo which follow, one fact is crucial. Philo claimed to have done much reading in preparing

---

[20] The first to render the title as "Phoenician Elements," was Orelli, p. 45, followed by Ewald, p. 65. Clemen, p. 32, Eissfeldt, T. und S. p. 34, and Williams, p. 120 prefer this translation. The translation "Phoenician Alphabet" was adopted by Movers, p. 117; Lobeck, pp. 1339-1341; Renan, p. 282.

[21] It should be added, however, that the two translations may both be correct. The Greek numbers were letters, and for some, particularly Pythagoreans, numbers were the basic elements of things. A treatise on the alphabet might also be a treatise on the elements of the world.

XUM

his History (805:17-18) and he often discussed the opinions of his opponents at great length (807:26-808:2). The fragments discussed thus far hardly attest either extensive reading or long discussion of opposing viewpoints. The interpretations and theories accepted by Philo dominate almost totally. I believe that the fragment to be discussed can be properly understood only when one realizes that here the views of opponents are presented and criticized.

814:23-25 tēn - Aigyptioi.

Taautos considered the snake divine. Since Taautos is Sanchuniathon's and hence Philo's supposed authority (804:22-805:1), Philo must agree with this divinization. On what grounds?[22] In the introduction to the Phoenician History Philo argued that the most ancient peoples accepted only two types of gods: mortal and immortal, that is deified mortals and immortal aspects of nature (806:9-10). The latter category consisted of the sun, moon, planets, elements, and "things connected with these," τὰ τούτοις συναφῆ (806:7-9). Snakes, I suggest, are also considered divine as one of τὰ τούτοις συναφῆ. The purpose of 814:25-815:15 is to explain the nature of the snake and demonstrate why it qualifies as an immortal god in Philo's system. If this interpretation is correct it is clear why Philo discussed snakes in the section devoted to the Phoenician elements.

814:25-26 pneumatikōtaton - paredothē.

The snake is described in physical, perhaps Stoic,[23] terms as containing most spirit (pneuma) and fire. The description may be incorrect, but is not supernatural.

---

[22] Cf. Williams, p. 196.

[23] See SVF, Vol. 2, frags. 715-716.

XUM

814:26-815:1 *par' ho-tachos*.

Other ancient authors, e.g. Aristotle and Aelian, knew that snakes moved by crawling.[24] Philo asserts that snakes move by means of the *pneuma*. I believe Philo intended to suggest some sort of jet propulsion.[25] This is, of course, incorrect, but again natural. One further possibility should be considered. There was one snake, the *iaculum*=ἀκοντίας, which the ancients said moved so fast it almost flew. This snake could attack from trees, flew like a javelin, and was accordingly named.[26] Herpetologists believe the ancient authors were discussing the *Zamenis Gemonensis Laur*., a snake prevalent in Italy and Greece.[27] Perhaps Philo's description was inspired by this snake. Whatever the case, jet propulsion was discovered in Alexandria[28] and the *iaculum* is not a Near Eastern snake. Philo's account of the locomotion of snakes seems therefore derived from Greek science. The nature of his sources must be determined accordingly.[29]

815:1-5 *kai polychroniotaton - pephyke*.

After the snakes' unusual means of locomotion their most remarkable characteristic is the annual shedding of their skin. Philo, like many other ancients, understands this as a process of rejuvenation.[30]

---

[24] Aristotle, *MA*, 9; Aelian *NA* 6, 18. See also Gen. 3:14.

[25] I am embarrassed to admit that the only other author to have supposed this is Charroux, *Maîtres du Monde*, p. 57.

[26] Aelian *NA*, 6, 18; Pliny *NH*, 6,85.

[27] See Gossen-Steier, "Schlange (Arten)," cols. 522-523.

[28] See Clagett, *Greek Science*, p. 101.

[29] Cf. Chapter Six, pp. 154-157.

[30] See Keller, *Antike Tierwelt*, Vol. 2, p. 289.

XUM

815:5-7 *kai epeidan - graphais*.

Given the annual rejuvenation, snakes only leave the earth when they consume themselves after having grown to the predetermined size (or, lived the fated number of years). Taautos supposedly discussed this in his sacred writings.

815:7-8 *dio kai - sympareilēptai*.

This sentence is an aside, directed against Philo's opponents: because of these characteristics the snake is taken as a sacred animal in temples and mysteries.[31] The mention of *mysteries* is the sign of disapproval on Philo's part, as Philo consistently opposes mysteries and mystery-makers (See 805:4-8; 813:3-7).

815:8-12 *eirētai - zōion*.

The snake is immortal, consumes itself,[32] and does not die unless it is violently killed. This supposed fact is crucial as it qualifies the snake as divine in Philo's theological scheme. It was therefore properly divinized by Taautos (814:24).

Philo's treatises *Ethōthiōn*, where one can read more on these subjects, are an enigma. Renan's suggestion, that Ethōthiōn= אותיות or, *A Treatise on the Alphabet*,[33] is not decisive if one holds that the excerpt from Philo comes from a section on the elements, not the alphabet.[34] Gutschmid and Eissfeldt have proposed that the proper reading is *Thōtheiōn*, that is, *Commentaries on the Teachings and Writings*

---

[31] An example of such use of a snake would be that described in Lucian's *Alexander*.

[32] This alludes to the snake with its tail in its mouth, a familiar image. See Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1,9,12.

[33] Renan, p. 282.

[34] If the argument in n. 21 is correct Renan might still be right.

XUM

of Taautos. Eissfeldt notes that this interpretation is supported by Suidas' attribution to Sanchuniathon of a book entitled περὶ τῆς Ἑρμοῦ φυσιολογίας, *On the Physical Doctrines of Hermes*.[35] But this is unlikely, as Philo consistently employs Taautos (Thoth is used only for purposes of identification) and the title of the treatise should be *Taauteion* or something of the sort. Moreover, the reference in Suidas may not be independent but based on Philo's ascription of everything in the *Phoenician History* to Taautos=Thoth.[36] It is therefore most prudent to concede ignorance and to suggest that the title of the work was so strange that it has become irretrievably garbled.

815:12-15 *Phoinikes - hierakos*.

In previous fragments Philo has assigned a position of honor to the Egyptians. They and the Phoenicians were two of the most ancient peoples who worshiped their gods similarly (805:25-26). The Egyptians, unlike the Greeks, are not a nation that copied and borrowed the treasures of others, but are among the originators (805:26-27). Of course, though, the Phoenicians take precedence. Civilization began in Phoenicia before Kronos assigned Egypt to Thoth (812:27-30). Accordingly here the Phoenicians come first in the worship of these divine beings. Philo says they call this god Agathodaimon, thus making them the founders of a cult originally Greek but in Philo's time long popular all around the Mediterranean and perhaps especially so in Alexandria.[37] The equation

---

[35] Gutschmid, *KS*, Vol. 2, pp. 20-29; Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau," p. 96.

[36] See 804:22-25.

[37] On Agathodaimon see Nilsson, Vol. 2^2, pp. 213-219 and Visser, *Götter und Kulte*, pp. 5ff. Visser stresses the connections with Alexandria.

XUM

with Kneph is correct.[38]

The hawk headed snake is a problem. A Hermetic prayer to Agathodaimon speaks of it as a bird and as a snake.[39] Representations of this figure, however, are harder to find. Cook cites a medal showing Nero as νέος Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων, on the reverse of which a bearded and crested snake appears.[40] But is this snake bird-headed or is it the usual representation of Agathodaimon=Chnum as a lion-headed serpent?[41] Perhaps Philo and the prayer represent some tradition, otherwise apparently unknown, in which Agathodaimon was bird-headed, or they may be misinterpretations of the lion's head.

815:15-17 kai phēsin - houtōs.

Epeeis and his supposed translator, Areios of Herakleopolis, are otherwise unknown. What is more significant is that they are Philo's opponents. Epeeis allegorizes and was the greatest hierophant, both sure signs of disapproval (See 805:4-8; 813:3-7). Accordingly, they must have misused the "facts" about snakes presented by Taautos.

815:18-20 to prōton - egineto.

Williams notes that the ideas in this passage are similar to those in a Hermetic prayer to Agathodaimon.[42]

815:20-22 emphasin - diaugasai.

---

[38] For the equation of Kneph and Agathodaimon see Wilcken "Aegyptische Prophetie," p. 548.

[39] The prayer is in Reitzenstein, Poimandres, pp. 28-29. Compare VII,2 and VII,8.

[40] Cook, Zeus, Vol. 2^2, p. 1128, fig. 956.

[41] See Delatte and Derchain, Intailles, pp. 54ff. Cf. Bidez-Cumont, Mages Hellénisés, p. 157, n. 1.

[42] Williams, p. 45. The prayer is the one cited above, n. 39.

This is Philo's comment on the quotation from Epeeis. Epeeis, like Taautos, realized the fiery nature of the serpent as his choice of words makes clear.

815:22-25 *para Phoinikōn - lexomenon*.

The charge that Pherekydes of Syros learned all from Phoenicians is repeated by Suidas. In his notice on Pherekydes Suidas writes that he is said: ἑαυτὸν ἀσκῆσαι κτησάμενα τὰ Φοινίκων ἀπόκρυφα βιβλία, "to have trained himself, having acquired the secret books of the Phoenicians."[43] Neither statement need be worth much. Suidas may be dependent on Philo, and Philo may be at his usual game of claiming priority for the Phoenicians.[44]

As to the god Ophioneus and the Ophionides, Philo's further remarks have been omitted by Eusebius. We know from other sources that Pherekydes told of a war between Kronos and Ophioneus, who must have been some sort of snaky monster.[45]

815:25-30 *eti mēn - sēmainontes*.

Philo also disapproves of the symbolism of the cosmos in which a circle represents the world and the snake stretched out in the middle Agathodaimon, the connective bond of the cosmos. Philo would call this physiologizing (See 805:6 and 813:5-6).

Philo is not the only author to interpret the symbolism of the theta in a cosmic sense. A scholion on Dion. Thrac. reports a similar interpretation.[46] What is confusing in this passage is the emphasis on the Egyptian figure, as the Phoenicians seem to have had a different figure of their own. Macrobius reports that the Phoenicians represented the world by a snake devouring its own tail.[47] As a letter of the alphabet this figure would be an o, not a theta, and the snake is here the circumference. Why Philo chose to emphasize the Egyptian and not the Phoenician figure we do not know.

---

[43] DK 7 A 2.

[44] Walcot. *Hesiod*, pp. 18-22, maintains that analysis of the scanty remains of Pherekydes suggests that the charge made by Philo may be accurate. For a different conclusion see K & R, p. 68.

[45] For a discussion of Pherekydes' account of this battle see K & R, pp. 65-68.

815:30-816:6 *kai Zōroastrēs - heuretēs*.

Zoroaster too is one of Philo's opponents, as is shown by 816:7-8. The notions ascribed tc Zoroaster are highly hellenized.[48]

816:6-7 *ta d' auta - Oktateuchōi*

Ostanes, Zoroaster's pupil, expressed similar ideas.[49]

816:7-9 *pantes - prokeitai*.

This is Philo's parting shot at his enemies: they physiologized what they borrowed from Taautos. The charges of borrowing and physiologizing prove that Philo is accusing opponents.

816:9-12 *kai ta-opheōn*.

These opponents, as is appropriate for physiologizers, understood the snakes as representing the elements and accordingly consecrated

---

[46] Schol. Dion. Thrac. p. 321,37 and 488 Hilgard: θῆτα ὅτι τοῦ παντὸς θέσιν μιμεῖται· ἡ δὲ τοῦ παντὸς θέσις ἐστιν ὁ οὐρανός, ὅς τό τε κυκλοτερὲς ἔχει καὶ τὸν διὰ μέσου ἄξονα τῇ κατὰ μέσον χαρακτηρισθέντα μακρᾷ. I have not seen any representations of this theta-shaped figure.

[47] Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1,9,12. This figure is much like the Ophite diagram from Celsus. For an example of such a figure see Leisegang, *Gnosis*, plate opposite p. 145.

[48] See Bidez-Cumont, *Mages Hellénisés*, Vol. 1, pp. 63,101. Vol. 2, pp. 157-158.

[49] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 173.

XUM

the snakes in the adyta of temples,[50] offered sacrifices and performed secret rites (a final, sure sign that Philo is accusing opponents).

816:13-22 alla gar - theologia.

These are Eusebius' final comments. Philo has been an excellent source for Eusebius' polemical purposes. He offers evidence certified by the practice of the Phoenicians. Moreover, his theories are clearly damaging to paganism and exclude any more favorable interpretation.

To conclude the analysis of the section on snakes, when one separates the theories of opponents from Philo's own theories it seems likely that the passage comes from the Phoenician History. The theories propounded in the introduction to that work are the key to the separation. That Philo, in this section, attacks ideas about snakes popular in his day is neither surprising nor important. More interesting is that the "physical" or "natural" description of the snakes (approved by Philo) seems a product of Greek science or pseudo-science. As in the case of the cosmogony, Philo's immediate sources must be dated sufficiently late to allow for this influence.

V

The fragments of the Phoenician History discussed in this dissertation all seemingly come from the first book. There were, however, at least seven more books in the original work.[51] What was discussed in these books? Did Philo ever leave what we would call Phoenician mythology and discuss actual events or history? These questions cannot be answered, given the sparse fragments we possess from the remaining books (816:24-817:21). These fragments, however, all mention Philo's work in a mythological context (The Phoenician stories of Kronos, 816:25-27, the vocalization of Nasibis, 817:6, and the interpretation of Iao, 817:17-18). They suggest that Philo never left mythology for actual history in his work.

---

[50] Cf. the passage from Macrobius cited above, n. 47.

[51] See Chapter Five, pp. 77-78.

XUM

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSIONS

The information we possess concerning the life and works of Philo of Byblos comes primarily from the entries in Suidas' *Lexicon*. The number and scope of the books attributed to Philo suggest that he must have been a learned man of broad competence. He must have read widely in order to write works such as *Concerning Cities and the Illustrious Men Each of them Produced*, and *Concerning the Acquisition and Selection of Books*. We cannot, however, be certain as to Philo's precise dates. The data in the entries in Suidas are contradictory and can be interpreted to support two different sets of dates. We can only be certain that Philo lived at the end of the first, and at the beginning of the second centuries A.D.: he survived to write a book on Hadrian. We have no information about where Philo lived.

Porphyry and Eusebius (interestingly, not Suidas) both attribute to Philo a book entitled *The Phoenician History*. Eusebius, in the first book of his *Praeparatio Evangelica*, as part of the refutation of paganism, has preserved long extracts from the work. These extracts are virtually the sole source about the *History*, as the work did not survive whole and did not much interest other authors. How Eusebius knew Philo's work has been the subject of some debate. While some believe that Eusebius copied the extracts from Porphyry's anti-Christian polemic, I have suggested that Eusebius probably knew the work independently.

XUM

Whatever the source, Eusebius preserved Philo's text quite accurately, although there are several cases where we have proven that Eusebius consciously altered the context, sequence, or wording of the original in order to make Philo fit his purposes. Such polemical distortions, however, are usually recognizable. Eusebius has, on the whole, preserved Philo well.

Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* itself is generally well preserved. However, in one instance we have a passage which presents serious difficulties in its current position in the MSS. of the *P.E.*, and have accordingly proposed moving that passage and reorganizing the text. Error, not intention, was responsible for the position of the passage in the MSS. The major fragments of Philo's *Phoenician History* therefore come from a well preserved author who took care to copy accurately (perhaps better, have accurately copied) the author he cited.

Philo's fragments are a source of great importance. The Ugaritic texts have taught us much about the mythology and religion accepted at Ugarit in the late Bronze Age. We have no comparable sources for the Iron Age, in particular none for Phoenicia proper. The numerous inscriptions and brief accounts in classical authors tell us little concerning the Phoenician gods or religious practices. In our relative ignorance the fragments of Philo's *History* are a source of major significance: they are virtually the sole testimony to the religious world of the Phoenicians.

Both Porphyry and Eusebius state, and the fragments confirm, that Philo claimed his *History* was a translation of the work of Sanchuniathon, an ancient Phoenician. I have shown that there were several different traditions about Sanchuniathon and that he may have been an

XUM

important religious figure of Phoenician antiquity. Among these traditions are the account of Sanchuniathon derived from the fourth book of Porphyry's *Against the Christians* and the account which Philo presented in the introduction to his alleged translation (both preserved by Eusebius). These two accounts differ as to Sanchuniathon's sources; according to Porphyry they were the work of Hierombalos and the collected city and temple texts, while according to Philo they were the works of Taautos (who is a Phoenicianization of the Egyptian Thoth). Philo also maintains that Sanchuniathon used the works of the *Ammouneōn*, but these we have seen, are probably the lost works of Taautos. Porphyry probably combined two traditions on Sanchuniathon: one, independent of Philo, which made Sanchuniathon's source Hierombalos; another, based on Philo, in which the works of Taautos became the collected city and temple texts.

Porphyry and Philo date Sanchuniathon. While Porphyry places him before the Trojan War, Philo does not date him directly. Yet, when Philo maintains that Sanchuniathon's work passed to Greece and became Hesiod's source, this implies that Philo dated Sanchuniathon sometime prior to Hesiod. Sanchuniathon thus would have lived in the late second millenium B.C., or early in the first millenium. If Philo's claim to have translated Sanchuniathon were true and his date for Sanchuniathon accurate, the fragments would contain information on Phoenician religion and mythology from about 1000 B.C.

I have tried to show, however, that virtually all the data concerning Sanchuniathon preserved by Porphyry and Philo is derived from a Hellenistic milieu. Porphyry states that Hierombalos, Sanchuniathon's alleged source, dedicated his book to Abibalos, but the

XUM

practice of book dedication first became widespread in the Hellenistic period. Porphyry's date for Sanchuniathon, at the time of the Trojan War, reflects the concern of barbarian historians to prove their native sources older than Homer. Philo's description of Sanchuniathon's discovery in an *adyton* of the works of the *Ammounēon* is an example of a *topos* commonly employed in later antiquity to give an air of antiquity and reliability to documents of recent origin. When Philo accuses the allegorizers, and especially the Greeks, of distorting and perverting the meaning of the original Phoenician sources, this too is a familiar trait of the "barbarian" historiography of the Hellenistic age.

Most damaging to Philo's date for Sanchuniathon is Philo's Euhemerism. In the introduction, Philo outlines the principles of his interpretation of the religion of the ancients, principles all supposedly formulated or at least accepted by Sanchuniathon. Philo asserts that the most ancient of the barbarians, particularly the Phoenicians and Egyptians, believed in only two categories of gods: deified culture heroes, and the eternal objects of nature - the sun, moon, stars, elements, and things connected with these (including immortal snakes). This interpretation of religion agrees with Euhemerus', and Philo consistently imposes Euhemeristic interpretations on his material. Thus he relates Phoenician mythology as if it were the history of the lives of various mortals deified for their contributions by a grateful posterity. His *Phoenician History*, in spite of the title, seems to have considered only mythological and not historical questions. Such Euhemerism cannot be ascribed to Sanchuniathon and to ca. 1000 B.C.

If the description of Sanchuniathon is thoroughly Hellenistic, and if his supposed theory for interpreting ancient religion is of equally recent origin, what of the other material ascribed to him by Philo? This question has been central in the scholarly discussion of the fragments. That is, granted that Philo's material reflects the religious world of the Phoenicians, what is the period of the world reflected - ca. 1000 B.C. as Philo claims, or sometime later? Recent scholars, I believe, have been insufficiently critical in assigning dates in the first quarter of the first millenium B.C. to Philo's sources.

The problems are more complex than has hitherto been realized. Philo intended his work to be read as consecutive history (at least, that is the impression suggested by the fragments in Eusebius): first cosmogony, then zoogony, then anthropogony, followed by his account of the discoverers, and concluding with the wars of Kronos and the division of the world by his victorious party. Each section seemingly commences where the previous one has ended, the whole forming a single continuous narrative. I have argued, however, that the sections actually overlap: inventions are repeated in several sections and, more important, each of the major sections begins at the same point, with a cosmogony. Different cities of Phoenicia are prominent in the different sections. One section is in poetry while the others are in prose. I have therefore concluded that each of the major sections comes from the mythology of the town prominent in that section, and that Philo has combined the traditions of at least two cities, Tyre and Byblos (together with a verse cosmogony of undeterminable provenance), in preparing his History. Thus there is not one question about the date of Philo's sources but several, one for each of the major sections. (Why Philo attempted to give the impression of consecutive history is a question best deferred).

XUM

While the verse cosmogony is written in the same poetic technique as Biblical and Ugaritic poetry, comparison with the more abundant poetic remains of the Jews shows that the poetic form proves little about the nature and date of the contents. Analysis of the contents suggested that this text was based on ancient Phoenician traditions, but that these traditions had been demythologized and extensively reworked under the impact of Greek natural science. The verse cosmogony also seems very similar to the products of the neighbors of the Phoenicians during the first centuries A.D., a similarity which suggested that our text too may date from that period.

The discovery section also is not as old as some have claimed. The mention of Chousor, in particular, proves not the antiquity but the relatively recent origin of the material, since Philo's Chousor is an iron worker. The gap between Philo's information and that derived from the Ugaritic epics (where *kṯr wḥss* works gold and silver) is apparent if one but looks critically.

In the wars of Kronos, Philo tells the Byblian version of the common Mediterranean myth of "Kingship in Heaven." Philo knows these Byblian myths not in their bronze-age but in their classical or Hellenistic forms; they have been touched up to look more like Hesiod. Philo also exploits the similarities between the Byblian stories and Hesiod in order to charge Hesiod and the Greeks with error and untruth and to claim that the Phoenicians have the true and original account.

In summary, the recent discoveries from the Near East have not substantiated Philo's claims. They have suggested new understandings of many difficult passages (although much is still inexplicable). Scholars who have claimed that these new discoveries have vindicated

Philo and proven the antiquity of his material have been, in my opinion, overly impressed by what they suddenly understood, and insufficiently critical. Philo does present Phoenician traditions: this is indisputable. But he has not somehow discovered and preserved unaltered some texts from hoary antiquity. Rather, he has claimed that the myths as told in his time, and as disfigured by his various theses, are the true ancient versions. On the contrary, they were in his time recent versions of ancient Phoenician traditions (somehow associated with the name of Sanchuniathon), not relatively unaltered bronze age or early iron age sources.

Why did Philo write the Phoenician History? Part of the answer, I believe, lies in Philo's attempt to make the overlapping sources read as if they were consecutive history. The Phoenician traditions of each city might seem as if they were a mass of confusing and contradictory stories. These myths would need systematization and organization in which the relative position of each god would be established. Homer and Hesiod had achieved similar results for the Greeks; perhaps Philo (and as we have seen, some predecessor) intended to do the same for the mythology of the Phoenicians. Arranging the parallel mythologies as if they were consecutive history would be a means of achieving this purpose.

Another reason Philo wrote his History was to express his intense Phoenician nationalism and anti-Greek bias. Philo claims that everything useful or important happened first or was discovered first by Phoenicians. He delights in contrasting the "true" Phoenician sources with the derivative and deformed versions current among the Greeks. The Greeks are not originators but imitators, and bad imitators

XUM

at that.

Philo is not the only Phoenician--let alone, Near Easterner--to hold such views, rather he is the best and fullest example. Some traces of similar attitudes can be found elsewhere, as in the belligerence of the Sidonian whom Pausanias met. That Sidonian was argumentative, and asserted that the Phoenicians had much better notions about the gods than the Greeks. As Pausanias was Philo's younger contemporary, his Sidonian proves that Philo's attitude was not unique among Phoenicians of Philo's day. In addition to the passage in Pausanias there is the testimony of the coins. Several coin types became popular in Tyre during the third century A.D., a century or so after Philo. They show episodes from the life of Dido, or Kadmos teaching the Greeks to read and write (Hill, BMC Phoenicia, Tyre # 409 pl. XXXIII.6; # 488, pl. XXXV.1). The latter type, in particular, should be understood as expressing ideas similar to Philo's. You Greeks, the coin type proclaims, were illiterate until you learned to read and write from us.

To conclude, the material preserved by Philo affords a valuable insight into the Phoenician religion as understood by one man of the early Roman empire. He has distorted the traditional material and presented it in a Euhemeristic and anti-Greek manner, but behind the distortions one can see the outlines of a more traditional mythology and religion. That religion had been living, not sterile or stagnant, since the Bronze Age. It had changed in response to new conditions, particularly in response to the contact with Greek science and culture, but major elements of the Bronze Age cults are still recognizable.

XUM

INDEX OF ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANEP - J. Pritchard, *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, 1954).

ANET - J. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Third Edition, with Supplement* (Princeton, 1969).

Aisleitner, *Wörterbuch* - J. Aisleitner, *Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache*, in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Vol. 106, Heft 3 (1963).

Albright, "Aleyan Baal & Mot," - W.F. Albright, "The North Canaanite Epic of Aleyan Baal and Mot," *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. 12 (1932), pp. 185-208.

Albright, *ARI* - W.F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Garden City, 1969).

Albright, "Clemen," - W.F. Albright, "Review of Clemen, *Die Phönikische Religion nach Philon von Byblos*," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 60 (1941) pp. 208-212.

Albright, "Dwarf Craftsmen," - W.F. Albright, "Dwarf Craftsmen in the Keret Epic," *Eretz Israel*, Vol. 3 (1954), pp. 58-59.

Albright, *FSAC* - W.F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Garden City, 1957).

Albright, "Hauron," - W.F. Albright, "The Canaanite God Hauron," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Vol. 53 (1936), pp. 1-12

Albright, "Recent Progress," - W.F. Albright, Recent Progress in North Canaanite Research," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 70 (1938) pp. 18-24.

Albright, "Role of the Canaanites," - W.F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," in G.E. Wright (Ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, 1965), pp. 438-487.

XUM

Albright, *YGC* - W.F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, 1969).

Alt, *Essays* - A. Alt, *Essays in Old Testament Religion and History* (Garden City, 1968).

Alt, *KS* - A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte Israels* (Munich, 1959).

Avi Yonah, "Mt. Carmel," - M. Avi Yonah, "Mt. Carmel and the God of Baalbek," *Israel Exploration Journal*, Vol. 2 (1954), pp. 118-124.

BDB - F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1962).

BH - R. Kittel et al., *Biblica Hebraica* (Stuttgart, 1966).

Barnett, "Walcot," - R.D. Barnett, "Review of Walcot, *Hesiod*," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 88 (1968), pp. 150-152.

Baudissin, *Adonis* - W.W. Baudissin, *Adonis und Eshmun* (Leipzig, 1911).

Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," - W.W. Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," *Protestantiche Real Encyclopadie*, Vol. 17, pp. 452-470.

Baudissin, *Studien* - W.W. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1911).

Baur & Rostovtzeff, *Excavations at Dura, Fourth Season* - P.V.C. Baur and M. Rostovtzeff, *Excavations at Dura Europus, Preliminary Report, Fourth Season* (New Haven, 1932).

Beare, "Books and Publication," - F.W. Beare, "Books and Publication in the Ancient World," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (1945), pp. 150-167.

Beaujeu, *Religion Romaine* - J. Beaujeu, *La Religion Romaine à l'Apogée de l'Empire* (Paris, 1955).

Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," - E.J. Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," *Classical Philology*, Vol. 47 (1952), pp. 65-81.

Bickerman, "Christians," - E.J. Bickerman, "The Name of Christians," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 42 (1949), pp. 109-124.

Bidez-Cumont, *Mages Hellénisés* - J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les Mages Hellénisés* (Paris, 1938).

XUM

Birt, *Antike Buchwesen* - T. Birt, *Das Antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1892).

Bisi, *Stele Puniche* - A.M. Bisi, *Le Stele Puniche* (Rome, 1967).

Blass & Debrunner, *Grammar of the NT* - F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, Translated from the German by R.W. Funk (Chicago, 1961).

Blinkenberg, *Tempelchronik* - C. Blinkenberg, *Die Lindische Tempelchronik* (Bonn, 1915).

Bochart - S. Bochart, *Phaleg et Canaan* (Cadomus, 1646).

Bouché-Leclerq, *Astrologie Grecque* - A. Bouché-Leclerq, *L'Astrologie Grecque* (Brussels, 1963).

Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* - W. Bousset, *Die Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, in *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Vol. 10 (1907).

Boyancé, "Les Archontes de Platon," - P. Boyancé, "Dieu Cosmique et dualisme: Les Archontes de Platon," in U. Bianchi, *Le Origine dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden, 1967), 348-356.

Boylan, *Thoth* - P. Boylan, *Thoth the Hermes of Egypt* (Oxford, 1922).

Brandon, *Creation Legends* - S.G.F. Brandon, *Creation Legends of the Ancient Near East* (London, 1963).

Breccia, *Musee Greco-Romaine* - E. Breccia, *Le Musee Greco-Romaine 1925-1932* (Bergamo, 1932).

Breasted, *Ancient Records* - J.H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (New York, 1962).

Bright - J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1959).

Bright, *Jeremiah* - J. Bright, *Jeremiah* (Garden City, 1965).

Buchsel, "Monogenes," - O. Buchsel, "Monogenes," *Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 4, pp. 737-741.

Budge, *Book of the Dead* - E.A.T.W. Budge, *The Book of the Dead* (London, 1960).

Bunsen - C.J. Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, Translated from German by C.H. Cottrell (London, 1848-67).

Burney, *Poetry* - C.F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord* (Oxford, 1925).

CAD - I.J. Gelb et. al., *The Assyrian Dictionary* (Chicago, 1961-).

CIL - *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin, 1862-).

CIS - *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* (Paris, 1881-1962).

Carcopino, "Enfants," - J. Carcopino, "Survivances des Sacrifices d'Enfants dans l'Afrique Romaine," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 106 (1932), pp. 592-599.

Cassuto, *Adam* - U.D. Cassuto, *Meadam ad Noach* (Jerusalem, 1959).

Cassuto, *Anat* - U.D. Cassuto, *Haelah Anat* (Jerusalem, 1965).

Cassuto, "Baal Berit," - U.D. Cassuto, "Baal Berit," *Encyclopedia Mikrait*, Vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1954), p. 286.

Cassuto, "El Elyon," - U.D. Cassuto, "El Elyon," *Encyclopedia Mikrait*, Vol. 1 (Jerusalem,1955), pp. 288-289 .

Cassuto, "El Olam," - U.D. Cassuto, "El Olam," *Encyclopedia Mikrait*, Vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1955), p. 287.

Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous," - U.D. Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous in Ugaritic Literature," in B. Dinaburg Memorial Volume (Jerusalem,תש'), pp. 65-67.

Chabot, "Punica," - M. Chabot, "Punica," *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 10 (1917), pp. 5-79.

Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* - R.H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1903).

Charroux, *Maitres du Monde* - R. Charroux, *Le Livre des Maitres du Monde* (Paris, 1967).

Cheyne, "Esau & Usoos," - T.K. Cheyne, "The Connection of Esau and Usoos," *Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. 17 (1897), p. 189.

Clagett, *Greek Science* - M. Clagett, *Greek Science in Antiquity* (New York, 1966).

Clemen - C. Clemen, *Die Phönikische Religion nach Philon von Byblos*, in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft,* Vol. 42,3 (1939).

Clemen, *Lukian's Schrift* - C. Clemen, *Lukian's Schrift uber die Syrische Gottin*, in *Der Alte Orient*, Vol. 37,4 (1938).

Collart, Varron - J. Collart, Varron, De Lingua Latina V (Paris, 1952).

Contenau, Everyday Life - G. Contenau, Everyday Life in Babylonia and Assyria (New York, 1966).

Cook, Zeus - A.B. Cook, Zeus (Cambridge, 1914-40).

Cooke, Textbook - G. Cooke, A Textbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions (Oxford, 1903).

Cross, "Phoenician Incantations," - F.M. Cross, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Vol. 197 (1970), pp. 42-49.

Cross, Studies - F.M. Cross, Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry, (Unpublished Diss. John Hopkins, 1950).

Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," - F.M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 55 (1962), pp. 236-241.

Cumberland - R. Cumberland, Sanchuniatho's Phoenician History (London, 1720).

Cumont, "Cultes Solaires," - F. Cumont, "Deux Monuments des Cultes Solaires," Syria, Vol. 14 (1933), pp. 381-395.

Cumont, "Deux Autels," - F. Cumont, "Deux Autels de Phénicie," Syria Vol. 8 (1927), pp. 163-168.

Cumont, "Eshmun," - F. Cumont, "Eshmun," RE Vol. 11, Cols. 676-679.

Cumont, "Gennaios," - F. Cumont, "Gennaios," RE Vol. 7, Col. 1174.

DK - H. Diels and W. Kranz, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker (1966 Reprint, Zurich).

Dahood, Psalms - M. Dahood, Psalms (Garden City, 1966-70).

Danielou, "Mauvais Gouvernement," - J. Danielou, "Le Mauvais Gouvernement du Monde d'après le Gnosticisme," in U. Bianchi, Le Origine dello Gnosticismo (Leiden, 1967), pp. 448-459.

Delatte & Derchain, Intailles - A. Delatte and Ph. Derchain, Les Intailles Magiques Gréco-égyptiennes (Paris, 1964).

Della Vida, "El Elyon," - R. Della Vida, "El Elyon in Gen. 14:18-20," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 63 (1944), pp. 1-9.

Denniston, "Dedication," - J. Denniston, "Dedication," Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford, 1949), pp. 259-260.

XUM

Devreese, Manuscrites Grecs - R. Devreese, Introduction à l'Etude des Manuscrites Grecs (Paris, 1954).

DeVaux, "Canaan," - R. DeVaux, "Le Pays de Canaan," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 88 (1968), pp 23-30.

Dodd, Bible and Greeks - C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London, 1954).

Dodwell - H. Dodwell, A Discourse on Sanchoniathon, Appendix to his Two Letters of Advice (London, 1680).

Dornseieff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," - F. Dornseieff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod's Theogonie," L'Antiquité Classique, Vol. 6 (1937), pp. 231-258.

Driver, CML - G.R. Driver, Canaanite Myths and Legends (Edinburgh, 1956).

Driver, "Geographical Problems," - G.R. Driver, "Geographical Problems," Eretz Israel, Vol. 5 (1958), pp. 16-21*

Du Cange, Glossarium - C. Du Cange, Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis (Graz, 1954, Reprint).

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," - R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "L'Ancien Dieu Tyrien Ouso," Melanges de l'Université Saint Joseph, Vol. 41 (1965), pp. 1-29.

Du Mesnil du Buisson, Etudes - R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, Etudes sur les Dieux Phéniciens hérites par l'Empire Romaine (Leiden, 1970).

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Groupe," - R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Groupe des Dieux El, Betyle, Dagon et Atlas," Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Vol. 169 (1966), pp. 37-49.

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine," - R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine et Evolution du Pantheon de Tyr," Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Vol. 164 (1963), pp. 133-163.

Dussaud, "Byblos," - R. Dussaud, "Byblos et les Giblites dans l'Ancient Testament," Syria, Vol. 4 (1923), pp. 300-315.

Dussaud, Découvertes - R. Dussaud, Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'Ancien Testament (Paris, 1941).

Dussaud, "Ecriture," - R. Dussaud, "L'Ecriture des Ammonéens," Syria Vol. 15 (1934), pp. 297-298.

XUM

Dussaud, "Invention," - R. Dussaud, "L'Invention des Hieroglyphes d'après Philon de Byblos," *Melanges Picard* (Paris, 1949), pp. 334-337.

Dussaud, "Melqart," - R. Dussaud, "Melqart," *Syria* Vol. 25 (1948), pp. 205-230.

Dussaud, Mythologie Phénicienne," - R. Dussaud, "La Mythologie Phénicienne d'après les Tablettes de Ras Shamra," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 104 (1931), pp. 353-408.

Ebeling, *Tod und Leben* - E. Ebeling, *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* (Berlin, 1931).

Edelstein, *Asclepius* - E.J. and L. Edelstein, *Asclepius* (Baltimore, 1945).

Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau," - O. Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau der Phönizischen Geschichte des Philon von Byblos," *Syria* Vol. 33 (1956), pp. 88-95.

Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon* - O. Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer* (Halle, 1932).

Eissfeldt, "Bethel," - O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Bethel," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 28 (1930), pp. 1-30.

Eissfeldt, *Introduction* - O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, An Introduction,* Translated from the German by P. Ackroyd (New York, 1965).

Eissfeldt, "Kosmogonie," - O. Eissfeldt, "Phönikische und Griechische Kosmogonie," in *Elements Orientaux dans la Religion Grecque Ancienne*, (Paris, 1960), pp. 1-15.

Eissfeldt, *RS* - O. Eissfeldt, *Ras Shamra und Sanchuniathon*, in *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums*, Heft 4 (1939).

Eissfeldt, *S. von B.* - O. Eissfeldt, *Sanchuniathon von Beirut und Ilimilku von Ugarit*, in *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums*, Heft 5 (1952).

Eissfeldt, *T. und S.* - O. Eissfeldt, *Taautos und Sanchuniathon*, in *Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1952), no. 1.

Eissfeldt, "Tabor," - O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Tabor," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* Vol. 31 (1934), pp. 1-34.

Eissfeldt, "Tyros," - O. Eissfeldt, "Tyros," *RE* Second Series, Vol. 7^2, Cols. 1876-1908.

XUM

Erman, "Denkmal," - H. Erman, "Ein Denkmal Memphitischer Theologie," in Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1911), pp. 916-950.

Ewald - H. Ewald, "Abhandlungen über die Phönikischen Ansichten von der Weltschöpfung und den Geschichtlichen Wert Sanchuniathon's" Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Vol. 5 (1851), pp. 1-68.

FGrH - F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (Leiden, 1923-58).

Farnell, Cults - L. R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States (Oxford, 1896-1909).

Festugiere, Revelation - A.J. Festugiere, La Revelation d'Hermes Trismegiste (Paris, 1949-54).

Frankfort, BP - H. Frankfort et. al., Before Philosophy (Aylesburg, 1959).

Frazier, Golden Bough - J.G. Frazier, The Golden Bough, Edited with notes by T.H. Gaster (Garden City, 1961).

Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien - J. Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien (Breslau, 1875).

Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar - A. Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar (Oxford, 1969).

Gaisford, Suidae Lexicon - T. Gaisford, Suidae Lexicon Graece et Latine (Halle, 1852).

Gaster, Thespis - T.H. Gaster, Thespis (Garden City, 1961).

Court de Gebelin, Allégories Orientales - M. Court de Gebelin, Allégories Orientales ou le fragment de Sanchuniathon (Paris, 1773).

Gifford, Eusebii Pamphili - E.H. Gifford, Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV (Oxford, 1903).

Gifford, Eusebius - E.H. Gifford, Eusebius, Preparation for the Gospel (Oxford, 1903).

Ginsberg, "Anath and Aqhat," - H.L. Ginsberg, "The North Canaanite Epic of Anath and Aqhat," Bulletin American Schools of Oriental Research, Vol. 98 (1945), pp. 15-23.

Ginsberg, "Milon," - H.L. Ginsberg, "Lemilon Leshon Hamiqra," Yallon Festschrift (Jerusalem, 1963), pp. 167-173.

Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon," - H.L. Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon in Isaiah after 715 B.C.E.," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 88 (1968), pp. 47-54.

Ginzberg, *Legends* - L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1909).

Gordon, *UT* - C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1965).

Grant, "Etres Intermediaires," - R.M. Grant, "Les Etres Intermediaires dans le Judaisme Tardif," in U. Bianchi, *Le Origine dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden, 1967), pp. 141-157.

Gruppe - O. Gruppe, *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythe* (Leipzig, 1887).

Gudemann, "Herennius," - A. Gudemann, "Herennius," *RE* Vol. 8, cols. 650-661.

Güterbock, *Kumarbi* - H.G. Guterbock, *Kumarbi* (Istanbul, 1946).

Guthrie, "Cabiri" - W.K.C. Guthrie, "Cabiri," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 150-151.

Guthrie, *ITB* - W.K.C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning* (Ithaca, 1965).

Gutschmid, *KS* - A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1889).

Halevy, "Pothos et Mot," - J. Halevy, "Les Principes Cosmogoniques Phéniciens Pothos et Mot," *Melanges de Critique et d'Histoire*, (Paris, 1883), pp. 381-388.

Harris, *Development* - Z.S. Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (New Haven, 1939).

Harris, *Grammar* - Z.S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven, 1936).

Held, "Additional Pairs," - M. Held, "Additional Pairs of Words in Synonymous Parallelism," *Leshonenu* Vol. 18 (1953), pp. 145-160.

Held, "Azitawadda," - M. Held, "Azitawadda in the Light of Old Babylonian Royal Inscriptions," (in press).

Held, "Factitive-Passive," - M. Held, "The Factitive-Passive Sequence of Identical Verbs," *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol. 84 (1965), pp. 272-282.

Held, "YQTL-QTL," - M. Held, "The YQTL-QTL Sequence of Identical Verbs," in M. Ben Horin (Ed.), *Studies and Essays in honor of A.A. Neuman* (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 281-291.

Held, Zbl/sbl," - M. Held, "The Root Zbl/sbl in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol. 88 (1968), pp. 90-96.

XUM

Henry, Eusebe et Plotin - P. Henry, Recherches sur la Preparation Evangelique d'Eusebe et l'Edition Perdue des Oeuvres de Plotin, (Paris, 1935).

Hill, BMC Phoenicia - G.F. Hill, Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia (London, 1910).

Hirschfeld, "Attischen Kunstlerinschriften," - G. Hirschfeld, "Nachträge zu den Attischen Kunstlerinschriften," Archäologische Zeitung, N.S. Vol. 5 (1873), pp. 19-29.

Höfer, "Io," - O. Höfer, "Io," Roscher, Lexicon, Vol. 2^1, cols. 263-279.

Höfer, "Pothos," - O. Höfer, "Pothos," Roscher, Lexicon, Vol. 3^2, cols. 2903-2906.

Höfer, "Semesilam," - O. Höfer, "Semesilam," Roscher, Lexicon, Vol. 4, col. 677.

Hölscher, "Anaximander," - U. Hölscher, "Anaximander und die Anfänge der Philosophie," Hermes Vol. 81 (1953), pp. 257-277 & 385-418.

How & Wells - W.W. How & J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus (Oxford, 1928).

IGLS - J. Jalabert, R. Mouterde et. al., Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie (Paris, 1929-).

Ingholt, "Hamman," - M. Ingholt, "Le Sens du Mot Hamman," in Melanges Dussaud (Paris, 1939), pp. 795-802.

Iriarte - J. Iriarte, Regiae Bibliothecae Matritensis Codices Graeci (Madrid, 1769).

Jacoby, Apollodors Chronik - F. Jacoby, Apollodors Chronik, Philologische Untersuchungen Vol. 16 (1902).

Jaeger, Theology - W. Jaeger, The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers (Oxford, 1967).

Jenni, Olam - E.S. Jenni, Das Wort olam im Alten Testaments (Basel, 1953).

Jensen, "Royal Purple," - L.B. Jensen, "Royal Purple of Tyre," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 22 (1963), pp. 104-118.

Jonas, Gnostic Religion - H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston, 1963).

KAI - H. Donner and W. Röllig, Kanaanaische und Aramaische Inschriften (Wiesbaden, 1964-66).

XUM

K & R - G.S. Kirk and J.E. Raven, The Pre-Socratic Philosophers (Cambridge, 1963).

Kahn, Anaximander - C. Kahn, Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology (New York, 1960).

Kapelrud, Baal - A.S. Kapelrud, Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts (Copenhagen, 1952).

Katz, "Septuagintal Studies," - P. Katz, "Septuagintal Studies at Mid-Century," in W. Davies & D. Daube (Eds.), The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 176-208.

Kaufmann, Religion - Y. Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel, Translated from the Hebrew by M. Greenberg (Chicago, 1960).

Keller, Antike Tierwelt - O. Keller, Die Antike Tierwelt (Leipzig, 1909-13).

Kenyon, Books and Readers - F.G. Kenyon, Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome (Oxford, 1932).

Kern, OF - O. Kern, Orphicorum Fragmenta (Berlin, 1922).

Kuster, Suidae Lexicon - L. Kuster, Suidae Lexicon (Cambridge, 1705).

LCL - Loeb Classical Library

Labriolle, Réaction Paienne - P. de Labriolle, La Réaction Paienne (Paris, 1934).

Lack, "Elyon," - R. Lack, "Les Origines de Elyon," Catholic Biblical Quarterly Vol. 24 (1962), pp. 44-64.

Lackeit, "Aion," - R. Lackeit, "Aion," RE Supplement 3, col. 66.

Lagrange - M. J. Lagrange, Etudes sur les Religions Semitiques (Paris, 1903).

Lambert & Walcot, "Babylonian Theogony," - W.G. Lambert and P. Walcot, "A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod," Kadmos, Vol. 4 (1965), pp. 64-72.

Lampe, Patristic Lexicon - G.W.H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1961).

Leipoldt & Morenz, Heilige Schriften - J. Leipoldt & S. Morenz, Heilige Schriften (Leipzig, 1953).

Leisegang, Gnosis - H. Leisegang, Die Gnosis (Stuttgart, 1955).

Lenschau, "Semiramis," - T. Lenschau, "Semiramis," RE Supplement 7, Cols. 1204-1212.

Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," - C.S. Littleton, "Is the Kingship in Heaven theme Indo-European," in G. Cardona et al., Indo-European and Indo-Europeans (Philadelphia, 1970), pp. 383-404.

Lobeck - C. Lobeck, Aglaophamus (Darmstadt, 1961, Reprint).

Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," - F. Lokkegaard, "Some Comments on the Sanchuniathon Tradition," Studia Theologica, Vol. 8 (1954), pp. 51-76.

Lukas, "Das Ei," - F. Lukas, "Das Ei als kosmogonische Vorstellung," Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde, Vol. 4 (1894), pp. 227-243.

Margulis, "Ugaritic Psalm," - B. Margulis, "A Ugaritic Psalm," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 89 (1970), pp. 292-304.

Mariette, Abydos - A. Mariette, Catalogue General des Monuments d'Abydos (Paris, 1880).

Mariette, Denderah - A. Mariette, Denderah (Paris, 1870-75).

McCasland, "Religious Healing," - S. McCasland, "Religious Healing in First Century Palestine," in T. McNeill et. al. (Eds.), Environmental Factors in Christian History (Chicago, 1939), pp. 18-34.

McKenzie, Second Isaiah - J. McKenzie, Second Isaiah (Garden City, 1968).

Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien - B. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien (Heidelberg, 1925).

Mercer, EA Tablets - S.B. Mercer, The Tell-el-Amarna Tablets (Toronto, 1939).

Meyer, GdA - E. Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums (Basel, 1953).

Milik, "Cultes," - J.T. Milik, "Les Papyrus Araméens d'Hermopolis et les Cultes Syro-phéniciens," Biblica, Vol. 48 (1967), pp. 546-622.

Montgomery, "The Highest Heaven," - J.A. Montgomery, "The Highest, Heaven, Aion, Time, etc. in Semitic Religion," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 31 (1938), pp. 143-150.

Morey, Mosaics - C.R. Morey, The Mosaics of Antioch (New York, 1938).

XUM

Moscati, *Comp. Grammar* - S. Moscati, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden, 1969).

Moscati, *Phoenicians* - S. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians* (London, 1968).

Moulten & Turner, *NT Greek* - J.H. Moulten and N. Turner, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh, 1963).

Movers - F.C. Movers, *Die Phönizer* (Bonn, 1841).

Mras, *Praeparatio Evangelica* - K. Mras, *Die Praeparatio Evangelica* (Berlin, 1954).

Muller, *FHG* - C. Muller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (Paris, 1883).

Muller, "Wagenfeld," - K. Muller, Review of Wagenfeld, *Sanchuniathon*, *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1837,52), pp. 507-517.

Murtonen, *Philological Treatise* - A. Murtonen, *A Philological Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names* (1952).

NDM - S. Sauneron et. al., *La Naissance du Monde*, in *Sources Orientales* Vol. 1, (1959).

NE - M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik* (Weimar, 1898).

NEB - *The New English Bible* (Oxford-Cambridge, 1970).

NJPS - *The Torah, the Five Books of Moses, A New Translation* (Philadelphia, 1962).

Nagel, "Thoth," - G. Nagel, "Le Dieu Thoth d'apres les Textes Egyptiens," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, Vol. 9 (1942), pp. 109-140.

Nautin - P. Nautin, "Sanchuniathon chez Philon de Byblos et chez Porphyre," *Revue Biblique*, Vol. 56 (1949), pp. 259-273.

Naveh, "Aramaica Dubiosa," - J. Naveh, "Aramaica Dubiosa," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 27 (1968), pp. 317-325.

Niese, *Stephani Byzantii* - B. Niese, *De Stephani Byzantii Auctoribus* (Killia, 1873).

Nilsson - M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* (Munich, 1961).

Nock, "Vision," - A.D. Nock, "A Vision of Mandulis Aion," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 27 (1934), pp. 55ff.

Nöldeke, "Inscriptions," - Th. Nöldeke, "Review of N. Davis, *Inscriptions in Phoenician Characters in the British Museum*, in *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschafter zu Göttingen* (1863), pp. 1827-1835.

XUM

Noth, *IPN* - M. Noth, *Die Israelitischen Personennamen* (Stuttgart, 1928).

Noth, *Uberlieferung*. - M. Noth *Uberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle, 1943).

Oppenheim, "Mesopotamian Mythology," - A. Leo Oppenheim, "Notes on Mesopotamian Mythology," *Orientalia*, Vol. 16 (1947), pp. 207-238.

Orelli - J.C. Orelli, *Sanchuniathonis Berytii quae feruntur Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1826).

Orlinsky, *New Translation* - H.M. Orlinsky, *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah* (Philadelphia, 1970).

PL - J.P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina* (Paris, 1844-80).

PGM - K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (Leipzig, 1928-31).

PRE - Pirkei Rabbi Eliezer.

Peckham, *Development* - J. B. Peckham, *The Development of the Late Phoenician Scripts* (Cambridge, 1968).

Pétrement, "Sept Archontes," - S. Pétrement, "Le Mythe des Sept Archontes Créateurs peut-il s'expliquer à partir du Christianisme," in U. Bianchi, *Le Origine dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden, 1967), pp. 460-487.

Pfeiffer, *NT Times* - R.H. Pfeiffer, *A History of New Testament Times* (New York, 1949).

Pope, *El* - M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden, 1955).

Pope, *Job* - M. Pope, *Job* (Garden City, 1965).

Pope & Röllig, "Syrien," - M. Pope & W. Röllig, "Syrien," in *Wörterbuch der Mythologie* (Stuttgart, 1965), Vol. 1, pp. 219-312.

Porten, *Elephantine* - B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley, 1968).

Posener, *Princes et Pays* - G. Posener, *Princes et Pays d'Asie et Nubie* (Brussels, 1940).

Rabin, *Zadokite Documents* - C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, 1958).

Rabbinovicz, *Dikdukei Sofrim* - R. Rabbinovicz, *Dikdukei Sofrim* (New York, 1960, Reprint).

Reed, *Asherah* - W.L. Reed, *The Asherah in the Old Testament* (Fort Worth, 1949).

XUM

Reitzenstein, Poimandres - R. Reitzenstein, Poimandres (Leipzig, 1904).

Renan - E. Renan, "Memoire sur l'origine et caractere veritable de l'Histoire Phénicienne qui porte le nom de Sanchuniathon," Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Vol. 23 (1868), pp. 241-334.

Rofé, Emunah Bemalachim - A. Rofé, Haemunah Bemalachim Beisrael (Jerusalem, 1969).

Rohde, KS - E. Rohde, Kleine Schriften (Leipzig, 1901).

Roscher, Lexicon - W.H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Romischen Mythologie (Hildesheim, 1965, Reprint).

Rose, Handbook - H.J. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Mythology (London, 1965).

Rose, "Idaean Dactyls," - H.J. Rose, "Idaean Dactyls," Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford, 1949), p. 449.

Rosenberg, "Sedeq," - R.M. Rosenberg, "The God Sedeq," Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. 36 (1965), pp. 161-177.

SVF - H. von Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta (Leipzig, 1905-1924).

Sambursky, Physics of the Stoics - S. Sambursky, Physics of the Stoics (london, 1959).

Scaliger, Emend. Temporum - J.J. Scaliger, Opus Novum... De Emendatione Temporum (Paris, 1583).

Schaeffer, "El et Baal," - C.F.A. Schaeffer, "Temoignages des Cultes de El et Baal," Syria, Vol. 43 (1966), pp. 1-19.

Schöne, Eusebius - A. Schöne, Eusebius Chronikon (Berlin, 1866).

Schöne, "Untersuchungen Sappho," - A. Schöne, Untersuchungen über das Leben der Sappho," in Symbola Philologorum Bonnensium in Honorem F. Ritschelii Collecta (Leipzig, 1864-67), pp. 731-762.

Schröder, Sprache - P. Schröder, Die Phönizische Sprache (Halle, 1869).

Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," - H. Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," RE Supplement 9, cols. 1433-1582.

Scott, Hermetica - W. Scott, Hermetica (Oxford, 1925).

Segal, Ben Sira - M.H. Segal, Sefer Ben Sira Hashalem (Jerusalem, 1953).

Sethe, Amun - K. Sethe, Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis (Berlin, 1924).

XUM

Seyrig, "AS 30," - H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 30, Inscriptions," *Syria* Vol. 20 (1939), pp. 302-323.

Seyrig, "AS 39," - H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 39, Heracles-Nergal," *Syria* Vol. 24 (1944-45), pp. 62-80.

Seyrig, "AS 78," - H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 78, Les Dieux d'Hierapolis," *Syria* Vol. 37 (1960), pp. 233-251.

Seyrig, "AS 82," - H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 82, Une Idole Betylique," *Syria* Vol. 40 (1963), pp. 17-19.

Seyrig, "AS 83," - H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 83, Les Grands Dieux de Tyr," *Syria*, Vol. 40 (1963), pp. 19-28.

Seyrig, "AS 93," - H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 93, Bel de Palmyre," *Syria* Vol. 48 (1971), pp. 85-114.

Seyrig & Starcky, "Genneas," - H. Seyrig and J. Starcky, "Genneas," *Syria* Vol. 26 (1949), pp. 231-257.

Sherwin-White, *Letters* - A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (Oxford, 1966).

Skehan, "Song of Moses, Qumran," - P.W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses,' (Deut. 32) from Qumran," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 136 (1954), pp. 12-15.

Smallwood, *Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian* - E.M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian* (Cambridge, 1966).

Smith, "Aretalogies," - M. Smith, "Prolegomena to a discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 90 (1971), pp. 174-199.

Speiser, *Genesis* - E.A. Speiser, *Genesis* (Garden City, 1964).

Speiser, "Phoinikes," - E.A. Speiser, "The Name Phoinikes," *Language* Vol. 12 (1936), pp. 121-126.

Speyer, *Bücherfunde* - W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike, Hypomnemata* 24 (1970).

Spiegel, "NDJ," - S. Spiegel, "Noah, Danel and Job," *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (1945), pp. 305-355.

Steiner, *Sukzessionsmythos* - G. Steiner, *Der Sukzessionsmythos in Hesiod und ihren Orientalischen Parallelen* (Unpublished Dissertation, Hamburg, 1958).

XUM

Tallqvist, *Götterepitheta* - K.L. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (Helsinki, 1938).

Teixidor, BES 1967 - J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1967," *Syria*, Vol. 44 (1967), pp. 163-194.

Teixidor, BES 1968 - J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1968," *Syria*, Vol. 45 (1968), pp. 353-389.

Teixidor, BES 1969 - J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1969," *Syria*, Vol. 46 (1969), pp. 319-388.

Teixidor, BES 1970 - J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1970," *Syria*, Vol. 47 (1970), pp. 357-389.

Teixidor, "Nouveau Papyrus," - J. Teixidor, "Un Nouveau Papyrus Araméen du Regne de Darius II," *Syria*, Vol. 46 (1964), pp. 285-290.

Thureau-Dangin, "Iahdunlim," - F. Thureau-Dangin, "Iahdunlim, Roi de Hama," *Revue d'Assyrologie*, Vol. 33 (1936), pp. 49-54.

Torrey, "God of Sarepta," - C.C. Torrey, "The Exiled God of Sarepta," *Berytus* Vol. 9 (1948), pp. 45-49.

Van Selms, *Marriage* - A. van Selms, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature* (London, 1954).

Vian, *Guerre des Géants* - F. Vian, *La Guerre des Géants* (Paris, 1952).

Vincent, "Helene à Samarie," - R. Vincent, "Le Culte d'Helene à Samarie," *Revue Biblique*, Vol. 45 (1936), pp. 221-232.

Virolleaud, "Nouveau Chant," - C. Virolleaud, "Un Nouveau Chant du Poeme d'Alein-Ball," *Syria*, Vol. 13 (1932), pp. 113-163.

Visser, *Götter und Kulte* - E. Visser, *Götter und Kulte im Ptolemaischen Alexandrie* (Amsterdam, 1938).

Von Rad, *Deuteronomy* - G. Von Rad, *Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia, 1966).

Von Soden, *AHw* - W. Von Soden, *Akkadisches Handworterbuch* (Wiesbaden, 1959).

Wagenfeld, *Sanchuniathon* - F. Wagenfeld, *Sanchuniathonis Historiarum Phoenicae Libros Novem* (Bremen, 1837).

Walcot, *Hesiod* - P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff, 1966).

Weber, *Untersuchungen Hadrian* - W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leipzig, 1907).

XUM

Wellhausen, Prolegomena - J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (New York, 1958).

West, Theogony - M.L. West, Hesiod, Theogony (Oxford, 1966).

Westermann, BGM - A. Westermann, Biographoi Graeci Minores (Amsterdam, 1964, Reprint).

Wilcken, "Aegyptische Prophetie," - U. Wilcken, "Zur Aegyptische Prophetie," Hermes, Vol. 40 (1905), pp. 544-560.

Will, Korinthiaka - E. Will, Korinthiaka (Paris, 1955).

Will, "Sanctuaire d'Heracles," - E. Will, "Au Sanctuaire d'Heracles a Tyr," Berytus, Vol. 10 (1950-51), pp. 1-12.

Williams - P.R. Williams, A Commentary on Philo Byblius' Phoenician History (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968).

Yadin, Hazor - Y. Yadin, Hazor (Jerusalem, 1958-61).

Zuntz, "Baitylos and Bethel," - G. Zuntz, "Baitylos and Bethel," Classica et Mediaevalia, Vol. 8 (1945), pp. 169-219.